

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1972.

\* \* \* \*

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

- - -  
72-50 The invocation was given by Councilman Ed Hill.

- - -  
72-50 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

- - -  
72-50 The minutes of the meeting of November 2, 1972 were approved.

- - -  
72-50 Mayor John Gatti welcomed a class of 6th grade students from Cambridge Elementary School, accompanied by their instructor Miss Aleene Block.

- - -  
72-50 TASK FORCE ON PROBLEMS OF HOMEBUILDERS

Mayor Gatti stated that several weeks ago he asked the City Manager to appoint a Task Force to review five areas of concern presented by the Builders Association. This Task Force will report next week to the City Manager. To assist the City Manager and Council in reviewing the findings and recommendations of this Task Force in regard to City procedures, utility extension policies, and their application in the proposed annexation, he asked the City Council to appoint a group of outstanding citizens to act as a Review Committee to advise the Council on the development of policies that will accrue to the benefit of all the citizens of San Antonio.

The Mayor said he contacted these individuals and all of them are willing to serve. He recommended appointment of Mr. H. B. Zachry to serve as the Chairman, along with Mr. Tom Frost, Jr., Mr. Richard Calvert, Mr. Glenn Biggs, Dr. Earl Lewis, Mr. B. J. McCombs, and Mr. Alfredo Flores, Sr.

Councilman Mendoza made a motion that the citizens recommended by Mayor Gatti be appointed to act as a Review Committee on the findings and recommendations of the Task Force, in regard to City procedures, utility extension policies, and their application in the proposed annexation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garza. On roll call, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

City Manager Hunt stated that when this Task Force has finalized its work in the form of a report with findings and recommendations that this information will be submitted to the Committee through the Mayor.

- - -  
November 9, 1972  
img

72-50

\$35,000,000 ELECTRIC AND GAS SYSTEMS  
REVENUE IMPROVEMENT BONDS - SERIES 1973

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,418

AN ORDINANCE DIRECTING THE GIVING OF NOTICE OF THE INTENTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ELECTRIC AND GAS SYSTEMS OF THE CITY AND TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO PAY THE COST THEREOF.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Jack Locke, Chairman of the City Public Service Board, stated that a presentation with reference to the improvements that need to be made and financed by the proposed \$35,000,000 Revenue Bonds was made to the Council at its informal meeting last week. The schedule is such that they have a number of steps that have to be complied with before issuance and sale of the bonds can be accomplished. In order to meet the deadline, it is essential that the Ordinance be passed today and recommended that the Council so act.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mrs. Haberman, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Naylor; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

72-50

ANNEXATION ORDINANCES

Mr. Howard L. Atwell, 7407 Buckboard, spoke to the Council against annexation and stated that the underlined factor in all the opposition to the proposed annexation is the right of citizens to vote on the matter.

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Haberman, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,419

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 2759 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IA)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,420

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 2358 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IB)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Haberman, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,421

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 125 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA II)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mrs. Haberman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,422

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 3781 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IIIA)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Mendoza, seconded by Mr. Garza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,423

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 1394 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IIIB)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,424

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 782 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IV)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Haberman, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Naylor.

AN ORDINANCE 41,425

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 1526 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, (AREA V)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,426

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 7344 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA VI)

\* \* \* \*

71-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mrs. Haberman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,427

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 525 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA VII)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Haberman, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,428

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 4216 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA VIII)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,429

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 2393 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA IX)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla, Gatti; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard.

AN ORDINANCE 41,430

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 4472 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA X)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 Mayor Gatti was obliged to leave the meeting and Mayor Pro Tem Garza presided.

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Haberman, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,431

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 2179 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA XI)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Garza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,432

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 69.11 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA XII)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 At this point of the meeting, Mayor Pro Tem Garza was stricken ill and was obliged to leave the meeting. Councilwoman Carol Haberman was designated to preside in the absence of the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem as Acting Mayor.

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Mendoza, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,433

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 7.672 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA XIII)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Mendoza, seconded by Mr. Hill, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,434

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 144.90 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA XIV)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read in full an Ordinance which is captioned below, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,435

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LINES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 6.632 ACRES OF LAND, WHICH SAID TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. (AREA XV)

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,436

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT FOR A NET TOTAL PAYMENT OF \$1,886.75.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 41,437

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTS TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH CERTAIN SPECTROPHOTOMETERS AND MICROSCOPES FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,816.10.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 41,438

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH CERTAIN MICROFILM READERS AND BOOK CHARGING UNITS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$1,640.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 41,439

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF HEFFERNAN SUPPLY COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH CERTAIN VIEW MASTER EQUIPMENT AND PACKETS FOR A TOTAL OF \$1,933.10.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 41,440

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF WEINER NEWS COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC LIBRARY WITH CERTAIN LIBRARY PAPERBACK BOOKS.

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,441

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE REVEREND FATHER DOUGLAS FREDERICK STYLES, WHEREBY THAT LEASE AGREEMENT PROVIDING SPACE IN THE TERMINAL BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IS EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE-YEAR TERM.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Thomas A. Raffety, Director of Aviation, explained that this lease was with the Reverend Styles who has been administering to the needs of transient passengers in what is called "Chapel of the Airways" at International Airport. The lease is for 288 square feet of space and is under the same terms and conditions as the existing lease, which began in December of 1969.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Naylor, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,442

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF URBAN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT A CHAIN LINK FENCE AT RIVERSIDE GOLF COURSE, PHASE II, AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT TO COVER SAID WORK; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$8,150.00 OUT OF PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS PAYABLE TO SAID CONTRACTOR, AND SUM OF \$400.00 TO BE USED AS A CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Assistant Director of Public Works, explained that three bids were received ranging from \$8,150.00 to \$10,360.00. He recommended acceptance of the low bid for the installation of 3,345 linear feet of six foot chain link fence with three strands of barbed wire at the top and vehicular gates.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Naylor, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,443

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF HOUSE-BRASWELL CO. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN ACCESS ROADS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT COVERING SAID WORK; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$499,664.67 OUT OF STREET IMPROVEMENT BONDS PAYABLE TO SAID CONTRACTOR, AND THE SUM OF \$25,000.00 TO BE USED AS A CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Assistant Director of Public Works, stated that seven bids were received ranging from the low bid of \$499,664.67 to a high of \$594,521.15. The project will consist of a 36 foot roadway adjacent to the UTSA Site with curbing on both sides and 24 feet from the UTSA Site to IH 35 with no curbing and placed on the right-of-way so that additional roadway may be placed parallel in the existing right-of-way at a future date.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Naylor, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,444

AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH THE STATE OF TEXAS, STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT, FOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT I. H. 410 FRONTAGE ROADS AND JACKSON-KELLER.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, who said that this is a typical contract with the Highway Department for the installation of traffic signals. In this particular case, the entire cost of installation will be paid by the Texas Highway Department. The City is obligated to operate and maintain the signals after they are installed.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Naylor, seconded by Mr. Hill, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,445

AMENDING CHAPTER 38 (TRAFFIC REGULATIONS) OF THE CITY CODE: DEFINING CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: PROHIBITING STOPPING, STANDING OR PARKING DURING CERTAIN HOURS: DEFINING PARKING TIME LIMITS ON CERTAIN STREETS: DEFINING MEXICAN GOVERNMENT TOURIST DEPARTMENT PARKING ZONE: SETTING FORTH LOCATIONS AT WHICH ELECTRIC TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS ARE IN FULL SIGNAL OPERATION: DESIGNATING ONE-WAY STREETS: DESIGNATING STOP SIGN LOCATIONS: DESIGNATING YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY SIGN LOCATIONS: SETTING MAXIMUM SPEED LIMITS ON CERTAIN STREETS: ESTABLISHING PARKING METER ZONES: PROHIBITING PARKING AT ALL TIMES ON CERTAIN STREETS: PROHIBITING STOPPING, STANDING OR PARKING DURING CERTAIN HOURS ON CERTAIN STREETS: PROHIBITING LEFT TURNS DURING CERTAIN HOURS AT CERTAIN INTERSECTIONS: AND PROVIDING THAT VIOLATION HEREOF BE PUNISHABLE BY A FINE OF NOT LESS THAN \$1.00 NOR MORE THAN \$200.00.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, stated that this Ordinance is a confirmation of all of the changes that have been taking place in the traffic regulations. A complete review of the Code relating to stop signs has been made to correct spelling of street names and to verify each location. At this time there are 1,476 intersections with stop signs. The Central Business District has been redefined since some of the old boundary streets were wiped out by the construction of the expressways.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Naylor, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,446

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A WASTE DISPOSAL CONTRACT WITH SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY, AND APPROVING A DRAFT OF SAID AUTHORITY'S BOND RESOLUTION.

\* \* \* \*

MR. CARL WHITE, Director of Finance: This is the financial arrangement whereby the City goes through the San Antonio River Authority on a compact bond issue for sewer financing. This particular bond issue will be in the amount of \$1,440,000.00 that the San Antonio River Authority will sell. The City of San Antonio will guarantee the payment of those bonds.

What this does for the City is it increases the Federal participation from 33% to 55%. Here is what happens. The bonds will be placed with Frost National Bank at an interest rate of 4.75%. That will cost \$68,400 for one year. In turn, we will receive 4.17% in interest that we will have invested. We will invest these funds in certificates of deposit. We will earn during this time \$65,048 for a net interest cost of a little over \$8,000. In addition to that, we will pay the San Antonio River Authority two types of payments. One is an initial fee of approximately \$4,000 and that is based on 20% of the cost of the sale, and then we have a fixed semi-annual charge of \$1,240. So in one year's time, the cost to the City would be \$15,232.00. Now for this \$15,232.00, the City will receive, in additional, Federal funds in the amount of \$1,129.154.00. So, we are spending \$15,000 for an extra \$1 million.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Naylor, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Land Division Chief, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,447

ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF 0.041 ACRES OF LAND TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE BABCOCK ROAD WIDENING PROJECT; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$35,155.00 OUT OF STREET IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1970, NO. 409-02, FOR TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE BABCOCK ROAD WIDENING PROJECT AND THE WALTERS-MOORE STREET PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$2,670.00 OUT OF SEWER REVENUE BOND FUND NO. 820-06, FOR SANITARY SEWER EASEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALADO CREEK SEWER EXTENSION PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,448

APPROPRIATING FIVE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND NO/100 (\$5,100.00) DOLLARS OUT OF SEWER REVENUE FUND NO. 820-03 PAYABLE TO THE COUNTY CLERK OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, SUBJECT TO THE ORDER OF MARY D. HENDERSON AND R. H. HENDERSON IN SATISFACTION OF THE AWARD OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS IN CONDEMNATION CASE NO. C-911 FOR THE ACQUISITION OF A PERMANENT EASEMENT OF 0.503 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY, MORE OR LESS, IN N.C.B. 13834 SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, HERITAGE PARK OFF-SITE SEWER MAIN PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

City Attorney Howard Walker stated that in implementing the Heritage Park Off-Site Sewer Project, the City found it was necessary to condemn certain property interests. This has been done. Commissioners have made an award in this case of \$5,100. The money will be placed with the court to give the City right of possession. If the City should not agree with the award, it will be appealed.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Dr. W. R. Ross, Health Director, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,449

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH BEXAR COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT FOR PROVIDING SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO THE SAN ANTONIO METROPOLITAN HEALTH DISTRICT IN CARRYING OUT THE MODEL CITIES - FOURTH ACTION YEAR FAMILY PLANNING PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SAID AGREEMENT.

\* \* \* \*

72-50 Mrs. Haberman asked Mr. Hunt to explain the recent developments in the Family Planning Program.

City Manager Hunt stated that the State Department of Public Welfare last week said that as of October 1st for their part of the funding of three programs (Homemaker Services, Day Care and Family Planning) the recipients would have to meet the Welfare standards. Until now, all persons in Model Cities were served by these programs. The programs are now being assessed to see what effect this ruling will have.

The Council asked that the ruling be appealed by the City Manager.

72-50 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Robert J. Macdonald, Director of Intergovernmental Services, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,450

AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STATEMENT--HUD ANNUAL ARRANGEMENT, 1973, BY INCLUDING THEREIN AN UPDATING OF A RENEWAL ASSISTANCE

PROJECT; APPROVING SAID STATEMENT  
AS AMENDED; AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION  
OF SUCH AMENDED STATEMENT TO THE  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained  
by Mr. Winston Ulmer, Assistant to the City Manager, and after consideration,  
on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, was passed and approved  
by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla;  
NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,451

DESIGNATING THE 1973 FIESTA DATES AND  
FURTHER AMENDING SECTIONS 4 AND 8F  
OF ORDINANCE NO. 40278 DATED JANUARY  
13, 1972 PERTAINING TO LOCATION OF  
CONCESSION STANDS ALONG THE STREET  
PARADE ROUTE AND THE RIVER PARADE  
ROUTE; REQUIRING THE FIESTA COMMISSION  
TO REQUEST THE CITY COUNCIL IN WRITING  
AT LEAST 90 DAYS PRIOR TO THE FIRST  
DAY OF FIESTA WEEK FOR THE USE OF  
CERTAIN CITY FACILITIES.

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,452

APPROVING THE PRICE AND CONDITIONS OF  
THE SALE BY THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF  
THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO OF THE NORTH PART  
OF DISPOSITION PARCEL C-C-21, CONTAINING  
APPROXIMATELY 2499 SQUARE FEET, LOCATED  
WITHIN THE ROSA VERDE URBAN RENEWAL  
PROJECT, TEX. R-78, TO E.B.S. COMPANY,  
INC. FOR THE SUM OF \$8,746.50, OR \$3.50  
PER SQUARE FOOT.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Bill Toudouze of the Urban  
Renewal Agency who said that this matter was brought before the City  
Council several weeks ago for approval. Mr. Raymond Galindo protested  
the sale at that time and after discussing the matter, the Council asked  
that the Urban Renewal Agency attempt to reconcile the problem. Now  
only the north part of Parcel C-C-21 is being sold. Mr. Galindo has  
not expressed interest in this tract and has submitted a letter to  
that effect. (A copy of Mr. Galindo's letter is included with the  
papers of this meeting.) The disposition of the south portion of this  
parcel is now under consideration between the parties concerned.

Members of the Council discussed with Mr. Winston Martin, Executive Director of Urban Renewal Agency, the misunderstanding between Mr. Galindo and Urban Renewal. Mr. Padilla asked for assurances that every effort would be made to resolve any differences.

Mr. Martin stated that three members of the Urban Renewal Board have been appointed to work with Mr. Galindo and E.B.S. Company.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 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: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,453

CHANGING THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING FROM THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1972 TO WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1972.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 41,454

AMENDING THE ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A COMMITTEE PERTAINING TO THE BI-CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE UNITED STATES BY PROVIDING FOR AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND APPOINTING MEMBERS TO BOTH THE REGULAR AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

\* \* \* \*

The following persons are hereby named and appointed as representatives of the executive committee as follows:

Chairman	- B. J. "Red" McCombs
Vice Chairman of Horizon '76	- David Straus
Vice Chairman of Heritage '76	- Mrs. Vivian Hamlin
Vice Chairman of Festival U.S.A.	- Henry Guerra
Secretary-Treasurer	- Bob Roth

The following persons are hereby named to membership on the regular committee for terms expiring July 31, 1973:

Charlie Kilpatrick	Lt. Gen. Sam Maddux (ret.)
Jack Newman	John Steen
Ed Cheviot	Consul General Jose Cano
Nate Safir	Hon. Franklin Spears
Dr. Jose Cardenas	Don Garrett
Dr. John Murphy	Woody Keller
Buckner Fanning	Peggy Becker
Bishop Harold Gosnell	Valmo Bellinger

Bishop Patrick Flores  
 Martin Goland  
 L. E. Shephard  
 Mr. Doug McCall

Col. H. J. Dalton  
 Col. Leilyn M. Young  
 Mr. David Castro  
 Mr. Al W. Rohde

\* \* \* \*

72-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41,455

AMENDING THE CURRENT PAY PLAN BY  
 INCREASING THE PAY RATES OF SEVEN  
 FIRE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE POSITIONS  
 AND ONE POLICE DEPARTMENT POSITION  
 EFFECTIVE AUGUST 5, 1972, AS APPROVED  
 BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Jerome A. Goodloe, Assistant Director of Personnel, stated that on October 26th, the Internal Revenue Service approved the City's petition to grant a 1.3% wage increase to certain positions in the Fire and Police Departments. This increase which was provided for in the current budget, would bring Fire Department salaries to parity with the Police Department which has been the announced policy of the City Council for the last three years.

City Councilman Hill questioned the .3% saying that the Council has only been considering 1% at this time. He felt that this might break parity the other way.

Associate City Manager George Bichsel explained that in the positions of Fire Fighter and Patrolman, the difference in parity was 1%. However, in other positions the difference was slightly more. He assured the Council that the entire matter had been clearly stated to I.R.S. and that this Ordinance does accomplish parity as desired.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Padilla, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

72-50 ZONING HEARINGS

Mrs. Haberman announced to persons having zoning cases to be heard that due to unavoidable circumstances, a bare quorum of the Council was present. Any person wishing to have his case postponed would be free to do so.

Whereupon at the request of the proponents, Case Nos. 4712, 4775 and 4784 were postponed.

\* \* \* \*

B. CASE 4769 - to rezone the southeast 200' of Lot 17, Block 1, NCB 14067, 4200 Block of Bluemel Road, from "O-1" Office District to "B-2" Business District; located on the southwest side of Bluemel Road, being 113.08' northwest of the cutback between Bluemel Road and Wurzbach Road, having 200' on Bluemel Road and a depth of 209.18'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,456

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE SOUTHEAST 200' OF LOT 17, BLOCK 1, NCB 14067, 4200 BLOCK OF BLUEMEL ROAD, FROM "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

C. CASE 4771 - to rezone a 0.377 acre tract of land out of Tract A, NCB 14939, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 9400 Block of Wurzbach Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; located north of the intersection of Bluemel Road and Wurzbach Road, having 110.45' on Bluemel Road, 72.11' on Wurzbach Road and 65.52' on the cutback between these two roads.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Mendoza made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. Hill seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,457

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 0.377 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF TRACT A, NCB 14939, (BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK)

490

9400 BLOCK OF WURZBACH ROAD,  
FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY  
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2"  
BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT  
PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

D. CASE 4773 - to rezone Lot 53, Block 22, NCB 1635, 1514 South New Braunfels, from "B-2" Business District to "B-3" Business District; located southeast of the intersection of South New Braunfels Avenue and Denver Boulevard, having 100' on Denver Boulevard and 140' on South New Braunfels Avenue.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Mendoza, seconded by Mr. Hill, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 41,458

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE  
THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE  
ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN  
ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION  
AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY  
DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 53, BLOCK 22,  
NCB 1635, 1514 SOUTH NEW BRAUNFELS,  
FROM "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "B-3"  
BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

PUBLIC HEARING ON MAJOR AMENDMENT NO. 1 MODIFYING  
THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR ROSA VERDE PROJECT TEX. R-78  
AS PROPOSED BY THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF SAN ANTONIO.

CITY CLERK: This is a Public Hearing on Major Amendment No. 1 modifying the Urban Renewal Plan for Rosa Verde Project Tex. R-78 as proposed by the Urban Renewal Agency of San Antonio.

WINSTON MARTIN: This involves several minor changes to the Rosa Verde Plan. These things are the result of working through the project and finding that there were many street alignments and things like this, and I'll take them one at a time. There are going to be two opponents that I know of to the plan change. One of these I think we have a way of resolving. The other I am not sure that there is any way of avoiding it because of the alignment of Commerce Street, but I'll discuss that with you as we go through.

The first involves elimination of small housing sites adjacent to the expressway in allowing for the expansion of Columbus Park. Remember, in the original plan the Columbus Park had two sites, one on either side of it, which we called RC 2 and RC 4. As has developed the criteria for housing we found out that they were concerned about locating housing immediately next to the expressway because of the problem of sound from the vehicles on the expressway. It also made it difficult to get a tract large enough to put proper housing in the planning to put that housing in. What we have done is move the park over next to the expressway and in so doing we have increased the size of the park. You have approved the park plan upon the recommendation of the Columbus Society and others who were interested in the area. This simply makes official the plan that was adopted by Council regarding Columbus Park and sets up the new tract of land to be known as RC 4 as shown on the map in this present location and provides for the alignment of Columbus Street to make the park in the configuration that it now will be.

The next change is the realignment of Columbus Street which I mentioned before and, of course, this is simply to provide, again, proper access to the new park site or the existing park site with its addition and to provide the housing site which, upon the completion of this public hearing, will be put out for public bid for conventional construction which we have been most anxious to get under way in the area.

Next is acquisition of San Fernando school and gymnasium allowing more land to be developed for housing. This property is property that is presently occupied by an obsolete school building and the gymnasium building that is no longer being used by the archdiocese for its original purposes. We have been informed by them that they do not wish expend the money necessary to rehabilitate and maintain those buildings. They have made an offer to us to sell the property to us at a price that is within the appraised values of these. This is simply to make it possible for us to add this to our acquisition work load. Once that land is acquired the property will be offered for public bid. We have a bidder that already has already indicated an interest in this--that being Callaway Interests which has bought the property immediately to the north for some conventional housing to be built in the area. We were in hopes that possibly the gymnasium can be incorporated into a community facility which would serve the housing that will be developed in the Rosa Verde Project.

The next is creating a cul-de-sac at Salinas Street and San Pedro Creek eliminating a dead end that exists at the present time. In other words it simply makes a means of getting in and out of that much more adequately.

The next change is acquisition of five parcels along the east side of San Pedro Creek between Travis Street and Commerce Street for creek widening. Let me give you some background on this, because this

is where one of your opposition will come from. These properties were requested by the Corps of Engineers and by the River Authority with the idea in mind that San Pedro Creek at some time is going to have to be addressed. That is a very serious drainage problem. We are going to have to do something regarding eliminating the problem of flooding through that area. It is in the flood plain. As you know, you had presented to you recently a thought that perhaps some of the water that is now going to the present San Antonio River might be by passed into this section of San Pedro Creek and eliminate one of our flooding problems in downtown San Antonio. There are no plans at this date as to how either of these solutions would be proposed or would be done. The staff's thinking, of course, was that it would be wise to have available to us the authority to acquire whatever necessary right-of-way was needed when the plan was developed. Mr. Penner, who owns the Penner's Store which is located at the corner of Commerce Street and Camaron, of course, is greatly concerned in that he just expended some money on improving his building and he has a very fine business operation there. I was speaking to him earlier this morning. He recognizes that sooner or later something is going to have to be done with the San Pedro Creek. He has offered to the Corps the possibility of giving them an easement under his structure or under his building should they decide to go underground with the drainage. It might not make it necessary, hopefully, that his building would have to be damaged or acquired. Since we have no plans we don't know whether that's possible or not. What I am suggesting to you is that, as much as we would like to have all of these things resolved, there is no way until such a plan has been prepared by the drainage engineers and people responsible for it. Perhaps you would like to delete from the authorization of the plan change for purposes of acquisition New City Block 913 which is the property that is in question at this time, and we have no objection to this with the understanding that as this plan is developed and as the Corps of Engineer comes up with a design to solve the problem of drainage we may be coming back to the City Council asking again for authorization by a plan change similar to this one, to acquire whatever right-of-way becomes necessary at that time. So, if this is your desire I have the parcel numbers that are in the ordinance that should be deleted by your City Clerk at that time.

MR. ALVIN G. PADILLA: This is substantially the Penner property so to speak?

MR. MARTIN: This is the Penner property (ALL SPEAKING AT ONCE)

MRS. CAROL R. HABERMAN: Would you like to come up Mr. Rosenheim, please.

MR. ROSENHEIM: Naturally, if the deletion is effective we have no opposition and withdraw it.

MRS. HABERMAN: That's very fine.

MR. MARTIN: I will give the Clerk, if you desire, those parcels that should be deleted from this.

MRS. HABERMAN: Do you want to give them to him now?

MR. MARTIN: That's Parcel 761, Parcel 762, Parcel 763, Parcel 764.

MRS. HABERMAN: I think it would be safe to say that perhaps we will know a little bit more about the River, say within six months. That would be close timing however. You know we are waiting for the River Corridor Study to complete its study at which time our Public Works and other departments will meet to check with the Corps and see whether a diversion into this area of the Flood Water Control would be possible. At the present time it's not a legal thing as we understand it, but that the Corps is ready and willing to do what they can to make it legal in a sense so they will be talking to their legislators too. But the thing is we are waiting for the River Corridor Study to be completed.

MR. MARTIN: This is why I felt we needed to put the Council on notice that it may be necessary for us to come back very much with the same sort of request we have made this morning. But at this time I have no real justification for saying that we know what they are going to do.

MRS. HABERMAN: Right. Is there any other opposition to this? If not what is your pleasure?

MR. MARTIN: Next was the acquisition of the Leeds Store property for the realignment of Commerce Street in order to give the Welfare Building, which is part of the street development, or to retain the Welfare Building. In the original concept of the Rosa Verde Project, the Chamber of Commerce had recommended that the two buildings that make up the Market area be removed and a new structure be put in their place. As the study became more feasible it was determined that if you did this you would end up with a pseudo market or something that was not real, to say nothing of the tremendous investment that is in the two buildings that are there. In order to avoid having to take those two buildings, or these first two buildings, the Traffic Department had to realign W. Commerce Street in such a manner that it takes the property that is known as the Leeds Property in the ownership to Mr. Wells and family at the corner of Laredo and Commerce Street. I have Mr. Fischer here. They frankly have worked every way possible to avoid that taking. We are not talking about the entire building being affected. We are talking about something like 13 or 14 feet of the front portion of the structure would have to be acquired for the widening we are talking about. The Leeds interests, the Wells' interests are here to speak for themselves but I want to tell you that they have said, of course, that they would like to retain the remainder of that land with the understanding that some of it might be required for the widening of the street. My concern about this is-do you leave a substandard tract of land when you do this? It would be something like 90 feet in depth and would be extremely small. The Council will want to hear from them I am sure. My point is I have no way of resolving this for you as we did the other simply because Commerce Street can only go a certain way according to the Traffic Department. And in so doing you do effect this piece of property that is known as the Leeds property or the Wells' property. Let me go through the other changes since this is the only one I feel will be spoken to and contended.

MRS. HABERMAN: May I ask you on that though, is this any historical monument insofar as historical listing?

MR. MARTIN: It is not on the historical list at this time.

MR. PADILLA: Winston, can I ask you to please repeat again on this offset on Commerce Street? I don't quite have a clear picture in my mind particularly on the map.

MR. MARTIN: As we originally anticipated being able to do the Market we were going to be able to come at Commerce Street and take a portion of what now is the Market Building and ease the turn or jog that exists on Commerce Street at the present time. When it was determined that we had too large an investment and wanted to use from the standpoint of aesthetics and historical preservation the building that we call the Welfare Building which is the first of the two structures that make up the Market. Then Commerce Street, of course, had to avoid that building and, in making your radius in Commerce Street to do this it became necessary to take the the corner of Laredo and Commerce Street, or at least a portion of it.

MR. PADILLA: The corner is clear now, isn't it? That's where the old National Theater was.

MR. MARTIN: No sir, that's no problem-it's the other corner at Laredo Street. You are talking about Santa Rosa Street, where the theater was. This is the corner of Laredo and Commerce where the Leeds Building is presently located.

(SEVERAL TALKING)

MR. MARTIN: This also includes the authority too, should we be able to come to an agreement and get the money to do so, the acquisition of property that's known as Continental Hotel property. The owner has by letter indicated his determination not to improve the property or maintain it because it is not economically feasible after an engineering survey for him to do so. Then the only other change involved in this is the proper identification of the area that we call the Mexican Market

401  
as the Mercado area or Market area. It had been called retail previously and they wanted it identified as to its permanent use.

Let me say that it is imperative that we make this change if we're going to go ahead with such things as the Columbus Square Award which we're ready to build and get into and the re-advertising of the housing sites. I do know that there is a great deal of concern on the part of the property owner where Leed's is located. I can only say that we have tried to encourage them, frankly, to think in terms of providing a larger site for the Leed's Store in the immediate vicinity so that they might benefit from opportunity of growth later. They will speak to this, as I said earlier, and you'll have an opportunity here to hear from them as to what their desires are. As far as I know, and Mr. Fischer is here, there is no way of avoiding at least this 13 or 14 foot taking that is at the corner of Laredo and Commerce. I'll be happy to answer any questions but I think at this time it might be appropriate to hear from the opponents.

MRS. HABERMAN: All right, we'll hear from those who wish to speak, perhaps in opposition to this. Let's see, we have three signed: Mr. Marcus Eastman, Mr. Tom Thurman and Mitchell Rosenheim, if you have any- one additional? There is a lady who also wishes to speak would you ask her to sign? Mr. Eastman, as you well know from the past, we have a five minute limit.

MR. MARCUS EASTMAN: Yes, I think that I have this written down in order to limit it to perhaps less than five minutes. As you have mentioned, my name is Marcus Eastman. I represent the owners of the Leed's Department Store who are lease holders in this building that we are talking about at 401 W. Commerce Street. I am here to present an objection to Section C of paragraph 10 of the plan presented here today by the San Antonio Development Agency. In order to present our objection with the pertinent facts involved, I'd like to go back to the first presentation that the then Urban Renewal made before the City Council of the entire Rosa Verde Area. That plan was at that time to cut Commerce Street in order to eliminate the jog on the west corner of the 400 block of Commerce, which would be Commerce and Santa Rosa. I presented at the same meeting my objection to this cut asking that the cut be made from the west side of the building in order that we could continue in operation of our business.

MRS. HABERMAN: Excuse me. Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Yes ma'am.

MRS. HABERMAN: Our councilmen would like to have this pointed out as they discuss this. All right.

MR. MARTIN: This is the Laredo Street as it comes through at the present time and the property in question is the property which is all on the map in this corner.

MRS. HABERMAN: His time is running, so let's ask him... You'll just point where...

MR. EASTMAN: At that time I stated that we were operating a successful business. We employed over 20 people full time. We had an additional 20 people, ah, 12 people, I am sorry, 12 people part time. A good portion of these people have been with us for over 20 years and if we were put out of business that means that these people at this advanced age would be required to go out and look for a job. We also told the Council that we felt that we were a contributing factor to the economy of San Antonio because this store represents a total payroll annually of \$150,000. I also stated at that time that having been working in this block for approximately 35 years, there was no congestion of traffic due to the jog of the intersection of Santa Rosa and Commerce. I also requested that the City take into consideration that by eliminating, or rather from starting the cut, from the Leed's building west they would be spared the additional expense of acquiring the building and we would all be satisfied.

November 9, 1972  
mg

The Council took my presentation into consideration and informed Mr. Martin that I should meet with the Urban Renewal Agency and see what could be worked out. Following this recommendation I had a meeting with Mr. Roy Montez, who was at that time, I believe, assistant director to Mr. Winston Martin and with Mr. Stewart Fischer. We met in Mr. Stewart Fischer's office and Mr. Fischer made calculations on his slide rule and all this and he said that the cut could be made beginning on the west side of our building and that it would not affect the flow of traffic. Now, the decision to make this change was reached by the Urban Renewal as evidenced by their map of their land Disposition Plan offered 2½ years ago by the agency of all the property to be sold in the Rosa Verde Area. I don't know whether it shows it there... I have a copy. It shows the Leeds building as remaining intact. That map and the offering was made to the public to bid on. The map also indicates that the angle of the cut would be made at the beginning of the west side of the building that we are speaking of. I also would like to add that the building was inspected at the same time by the various City inspectors. It was found that the first floor was in absolute perfect condition according to City Code. The second floor required minor alterations and we were told by the Urban Renewal Agency that we would be asked to update and beautify the exterior of the building and we told them that all of the things that they asked, there would be no problem with we would comply with their request. Consequently, when the bids were opened for the - when bids were requested for the property in the Rosa Verde Area, and I believe that's some three years ago, Mr. Martin, am I correct? Over two years ago. Based on the assurance that the Leed's building would remain intact, we did not bother to bid on the adjacent property. (Gong) I'm sorry I just have a few more...

MRS. HABERMAN: We'll be happy to have you finish.

MR. EASTMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate it, because this is of tremendous interest to us, because this is our livelihood. We did not bid on the adjacent property because we were assured that the building would remain. Now, for reasons that I am not sure who instigated, the San Antonio Development Agency wants to change and make this cut beginning from Laredo Street which would mean that the building would have to go or partially the building would have to go and we are in a position where we can't make a bid on the adjacent property because, as far as I know, that property has been sold. Now, we ask you to consider the fact that had the change not been approved, we would then have had the opportunity to bid on the adjacent property and probably would have, whether we would have been a successful bidder or not we don't know, but at least we would have had the opportunity to make the necessary change. But now, it is certainly too late for that, am I correct Mr. Martin?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, the land has been awarded...

MR. EASTMAN: Right. Therefore, members of the City Council, we respectfully request that this Section C, of paragraph 10 be rejected by you because of the following reasons other than those I have mentioned. First, you would eliminate and avoid putting a business out that is growing. We ask that the cut be made on the west side of this building which is only a difference of 50 feet. We feel that the flow of traffic would not be affected, because it hasn't been affected in the past 40 years that I can remember and I have been there, and that's probably due to the fact we have too many arteries there and people are more cautious. I believe that these police records will show, if properly investigated, that there have been so few accidents at that corner this is absolute no impediment to the easy flow of traffic in that area. Now, that you are going to widen Santa Rosa Street I think the situation will be even better. Fourth, I want to tell you this, you can save the tax payers' money. If the building that the Leed's store occupies is going to be taken over, in my opinion it's going to cost the public money somewhere in the extent of \$200 and \$250,000 to satisfy the owner and I'm basing this on rental that he is receiving from us as tenant. In addition to that you are going to have to satisfy we, as lease holders for the interest that we have in it plus the cost of moving that store. By contrast, I offer you the following thought. If this proposition is rejected there won't be one cent of City money spent - or public money for that matter - to

beautify the building, to make the necessary minor changes which will be undertaken by both the landlord and the tenant. We can assure you that there won't be one cent spent by the City. The Leed's Department Store will remain as a contributing factor to the growth and economy in the City of San Antonio. I sincerely request that you give this your proper consideration. I thank you very much for your time.

MRS. HABERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Eastman. Tom Thurman.

MR. TOM THURMAN: Madam Mayor, and members of the committee, I'm Tom Thurman and I am appearing here on behalf of Mary Walsh, who is the owner of the real property under consideration here. Don't hesitate to point out that Miss Walsh's family has owned this property in excess of 100 years. Now, Mr. Eastman has very ably pointed out the historical factors, or back ground material that in my humble opinion present a prima facie example of detrimental reliance. My client is in the same position as that of Mr. Eastman. There was absolutely no way for her to protect herself after the decision was made some two and a half to three years ago by Mr. Fischer's office and Mr. Martin's office that the cut could be made from 50 feet to the west of the intersection of West Commerce and Laredo Street, I believe. The problems that we have attracted though here, I think quite frankly not being an engineer, are in the realm of conjecture. But the very real interest involved with my client are these: they have held and owned this property for 100 years and they do not intend to give it up. This is something that can be ... the remedy is there as far as the City Planning, Mr. Fischer's office. We do not feel the reasons stated by Mr. Martin, are adequate. That, in essence is our case. We feel that the expenditures contemplated in this area to condemn the property are huge in comparison to what our clients are willing to do. And I do confirm here at this time what Mr. Eastman said that all improvements to this property would be made by the landlord and tenant at no cost to the City. I think this is the most reasonable approach for the tax payers of this City and also the property owners who relied on past decisions of the Planning Agencies. I sure do thank you for your attention and I hope that you overrule, reject, or amend this particular modification of the right of way of West Commerce. Thank you very much.

MRS. HABERMAN: Thank you Mr. Thurman. Councilman Hill.

MR. ED. HILL: Let me ask Winston a question here. The width of Commerce Street before you get to Laredo...

MR. MARTIN: Before you get to Laredo? Sixty-five feet.

MR. HILL: Then from Laredo to Santa Rosa?

MR. MARTIN: It's 55 from Santa Rosa...

MR. HILL: But I'm talking about in front of Leed's.

MR. MARTIN: It's also 65 feet.

MR. HILL: But in taking the front portion of Leeds Store you are widening West Commerce at that point but you're not coming back towards City Hall.

MR. MARTIN: In other words, from this point on over it will not be widened.

MR. PADILLA: You really won't have any effective widening, you'll just start the curve. You're still going to have the jog you are just making it a radius instead of two right angles.

MR. HILL: Well, I was interested in you widening Commerce Street in front of Leeds but coming back east it's not going to be widened.

MR. MARTIN: We are not widening Commerce Street other than to provide for the full right of way that is there now.

MRS. HABERMAN: Mrs. Rubio, Mrs. Robert Rubio.

MRS. ROBERT RUBIO: I'm here to speak about something else but I became interested in this because I would like to ask the City Council - this is food for thought - if the selling of both properties comes about what is the City going to do when they get rid of the Welfare Building. Where are they going to send all the people who now are welfare recipients and have to go to that building? Where are they going to send these people? Are they going to send them to the extreme north side as they are doing now with part of the hospital?

MR. PADILLA: I hope not.

MRS. RUBIO: Thank you.

MRS. HABERMAN: Mr. Fischer.

MR. PLEAS NAYLOR: You seem to be the guy that they are saying that can't do this. Is this right?

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Naylor, the original plan was to avoid taking the Leeds. We worked to do this, however, at that time the plan did contemplate, as Winston said, taking part of the Welfare Building. Now, the choices, as I view this thing, are one of three. One is the plan as proposed here which would require the acquisition of a portion of the Leeds Building. The other choice would be to leave the Leeds Building and use a portion of the property occupied by the Welfare Building or, thirdly, to have a substandard connection through here. Now, these are about the only choices that we have in this particular situation.

MR. HILL: How substandard?

MR. FISCHER: Depending on how much we have.

MR. HILL: Well, what do you consider standard and you say...

MR. FISCHER: What we have designed there Mr. Hill, is for a 30 mile operation, which is what the street has. If we squeeze it down anymore, we could leave it the way it is, is what I'm saying - there's a degree. We do not have to correct the two right angle turns if this is the Council's wish.

MR. HILL: Well, no, but I'm just saying that you're saying that it's substandard and...

MR. FISCHER: It would operate at a speed below 30 miles an hour.

MR. HILL: The 50 foot width of the Leeds Building would affect it that much?

MR. FISCHER: It's not the 50 foot width, Mr. Hill. The curve under that proposal would actually start at the east line of Laredo Street.

MR. PADILLA: You're just moving the curb east.

MR. FISCHER: All we are doing is sliding it back and forth.

MR. PADILLA: You know the bad part about this is that if we change the plans as we go, for whatever reason, I think the very important point in my mind is the point made by the Leeds interest, the Mr. Eastman and Mr. Thurman, I think it is, Thurman, I'm sorry. The point that really matters to me is that we've changed the plans after the adjacent property, the opportunity of the adjacent property is down the river as they are concerned.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Hill, I couldn't agree with you more. Let me point out, however, that decision was done as a result of the consideration of the Market and that is not a Traffic consideration.

MR. PADILLA: I grant you but I think it's our decision now all together.

MR. FISCHER: Yes sir.

MR. HILL: Stewart, in your opinion, what affect will the widening and making a boulevard out of Santa Rosa affect the traffic on Laredo?

MR. FISCHER: On Laredo, Sir? The plans call for Laredo Street to be abandoned through portions of this area. Is it that block that is to be abandoned Winston?

MR. MARTIN: Yes but ... (inaudible)

MR. NAYLOR: Stewart, how severe is your problem if you leave the jog in there. I mean really, you can't really identify that at this time, can you? Or have you?

MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir, it's a problem. I think all you have to do is drive down Commerce Street at 4:00 in the afternoon, any afternoon, and you'll see the problem is there. But I can't give you measure of the thing.

MR. PADILLA: But in a sense you're not really fixing that jog. You're just improving it. Because the only thing that would fix that jog would be to eliminate it and make Commerce Street straight through.

MR. FISCHER: Well, if we are making it straight through for 30 miles an hour traffic, Mr. Padilla, this is what that curve does.

MR. PADILLA: You're still going to have a double curve to the right and to the left.

MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir, the curve is one that can be negotiated by a driver at 30 miles an hour. This is the intent of it.

MR. HILL: Well, I'm no traffic engineer, but it just appears to me that if you take off 12 or 13 foot of the front of the Leeds Building and in all your calulations this makes your west bound traffic 30 miles an hour, if you started at the west side of the Leeds Building the traffic would probably come down to 28 miles per hour.

MR. FISCHER: No sir, they would come down to about 18 to 20.

MR. HILL: Aww!

MRS. HABERMAN: I'm not real sure, are you taking the sidewalk...

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MR. FISCHER: Again, this is what ever the Council wants to do.

MRS. HABERMAN: Stewart, is the taking up the sidewalk definite regardless of the 13 or 14 feet of the building?

MR. FISCHER: No. There will be a sidewalk.

MRS. HABERMAN: No, I mean if their entrance were from another place. They are closing in Laredo Street.

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MR. HILL: Stewart, I'm not arguing with all your calulations and you as a traffic engineer, but from all practicality I don't see where 50 foot - start of that curve is going to make that much difference to the people driving the cars.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Hill, I tried to point out it isn't 50 feet it's 80 or 90 feet. Because the curve starts on the east side of Laredo Street. So you've got the 50 feet plus the width of Laredo Street right a way which puts it to about 80 or 90 feet at the beginning of the curve.

MR. HILL: Now, in other words we start on the east side of what is now Laredo Street.

MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir, we moved that curve as far east as we could in order to avoid the taking. We can leave it the way it was originally planned. In other words, the conditions we were originally given which was to take the Welfare Building.

MRS. HABERMAN: May I ask for a little more orderly questions if we can. Mr. Martin you would have rebuttal time but before you do Mr. Galindo signed up. Mr. Galindo we are limited to the 5 minutes. Do you want to speak on this particular issue? You came in after we started.

MR. RAYMOND GALINDO: I am here to speak for 5 minutes on two points. First to congratulate the Eastman's for having purchased today the two pieces of property owned formerly by Hewitt and Gonzales. By taking from them a little narrow strip which is our land (inaudible) there are 392 square feet. As you will see if you study that map. By buying from the Eastmans 392 square feet they have frontage on Santa Rosa of 66 feet according to the measurements I have been given at the office of Urban Renewal. By buying the northern part it took...(inaudible). Now, they have 132 feet facing Santa Rosa. They are very lucky. I congratulate them for that because that enhances their corner. Mr. Naylor is a realtor and appraiser - he knows how much that property with 132 feet of frontage will be worth sometime after it is improved. So I really come here to congratulate the Eastmans because they are very lucky people. The chairman of Urban Renewal, I wish he were here, I always like to make statements when people are present. Mr. Dietert, the chairman of Urban Renewal has told me sincerely, he is a high class gentleman. He told me "Urban Renewal helps some people and hurts some people too". As much as it helps it hurts. And you can see that yourself. All you have to do is go by the expressway and see how many streets have been closed - dead ended streets. Speaking of this particular point here by (inaudible) only 392 square feet. They have now become a corner. (inaudible) My son and I came here and we want to compromise because we believe in the philosophy to live and let live and to let somebody else live. Here is Mr. Eastman's livelihood. I like that word of yours, Mr. Eastman. We are here for the same purpose.

All right the point is this, that we have remaining 132 feet there of which I used to own 100 feet gentlemen. I used to own 100 feet and now we are still debating those 100 feet which properly belong to me and against my wish Urban Renewal through Mr. Martin, condemned it back in 1970. They took it away from me. There was nothing but 392 feet, it was 8700 if you please. More than 8700 feet, with a building two stories high containing more than 14,000 square feet of improvements. So much for that.

In other words, I just want to congratulate Louis Eastman, Mr. Henry Eastman with his son and his capable manager and diplomat... side with Mr. Martin. You will be surprised to know that in this case I am on the side of Mr. Martin. All you have to do is postpone this decision until next week. Take enough time to go and see that traffic between 4 and 5 o'clock and try to see if you are not on the defensive. Driving defensively try to see that traffic between 4 and 5 o'clock and you will see one thing. You will see double traffic going down there. You will see the traffic going in double. When I go there because I have to come through Laredo Street which is, by the way, still open to the northside going traffic. I have to go there and be careful that nobody hits me from behind or that I won't hit anybody from behind. That's the truth gentlemen. I wish you would postpone that to be a witness to this. I don't wish to be disputing the judgement of Mr. Fischer. (inaudible) I wish you the Councilmen would go there between 4 and 5 and just for your own self judge the traffic so nobody will hit you or nobody will hit you or you won't hit somebody. Because with this (inaudible) repairs are \$400 to \$450. So I want to stop here by saying this. I wish the Walsh people in this case would be touched for just a few feet. I have been touched for 8700 feet and I may be touched for another building if I don't do the renovating according to Urban Renewal. I wish you would please check up on Mr. Martin and Mr. Fischer and take a look at that corner more carefully instead of passing judgement right now.

MRS. HABERMAN: Thank you Mr. Galindo.

MR. HILL: I think you ought to ask Winston what bearing this would have from the overall project if you...

MR. MARTIN: Of course, the bearing is that we have a number of things that are involved in this. Unfortunately, the only way that you can keep from delaying these other things being awarded and going ahead would be possibly deleting this, as was suggested by their attorney, from your ordinance at this time. I don't think you can solve anything, because you are going to do something about Commerce Street. The utilities are here, the replacement utilities are involved, Laredo Street with construction going on. Again, the Traffic Department says that this is necessary to do. I am going on the assumption that it is. If it can be done without that property being acquired we have no quarrel with that at all, but we do have Commerce Street which must be improved because it is involved with what we are doing on Santa Rosa, what we are doing on Laredo and what we are doing in awarding land for housing to be built on Santa Rosa Street.

MR. PADILLA: You know, Mr. Martin, I hate to keep coming back to this. You might think I am being extra hard on you constantly but this word planning, this is precisely the term that I would quarrel with. First of all, we did not have the plans and this deprived the Eastman's, or the people that owned that property, of the possibility of at least having a chance to bid on adjacent property or property in the area for the continuance of their business. I don't like changes in plans or so to speak changing a horse in the middle of the stream or call it what you will. Changing the plans is essentially what it is. Way down the road. So the people are left just on the outside looking in. I think the plans ought to be a little more thorough than that. We do have a responsibility to the people, of course, We also have a responsibility to the property owners in the areas in question. I dislike very much changing something in the middle, after the fact, as far as at least some of our citizens are concerned. It just leaves them on the outside looking in. I don't like that. I think our plans should be to a little higher caliber or a little better quality.

MR. MARTIN: Let me say this to that. I don't think there is any plan that's that static. Number one, the Market analysis determined whether those buildings should stay or go. They were not forbidden to bid. Those chose not to bid because they felt it was not necessary...

MR. PADILLA: Because under the existing plans...precisely...Well, I understand that. But they had no need to bid as they understood the project at the time.

MRS. HABERMAN: Councilman Naylor, do you have any questions?

MR. HILL: How far back does the Welfare Building sit from the curb line on Santa Rosa.

MR. MARTIN: You have approximately about 12 or 14 feet, Mr. Hill. I'm not sure about it.

MR. HILL: I thought it was more than that.

MR. NAYLOR: What is the adjoining property to Leeds?

MR. MARTIN: All of this adjacent to Leeds now, this has all been cleared. There is property here that is scheduled for clearance. This is one tract of land that was offered for sale and has been bid on two buys by the Basila interests who owned property back here.

MR. NAYLOR: Are the Basila interests willing to work out anything? Has anybody approached them?

MR. MARTIN: We talked to them about the possibility of trying to acquire some land back here but they are proposing a multi-story building and office space and hotel space.

MR. NAYLOR: But what I mean is have they expressed any willingness to do something with Leeds?

MR. MARTIN: Oh yes. They talked about having them as a tenant in their new building and Leeds felt that the cost would be prohibitive because of the amount they would have to pay to lease space in the new building.

November 9, 1972

mg

MRS. HABERMAN: Are there any other questions by Council?

MR. HILL: I was going to ask Stewart, Stewart was there any consideration given to knocking the corner off of the street side in front of the Welfare Building?

MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir. That was the original plan. That was the one that the people developing the Market told us they wouldn't accept. That's why we had to look at doing it a different way.

MR. PADILLA: It's more logical to knock a corner off of both sides of the street, whenever you have a jog like this, isn't it?

MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir. It really would be a better solution, yes sir. One of the things that has to be done is that we have to be able to cross Santa Rosa on a straight line. We cannot lay a curve across an intersection because there is nothing to delineate the curve and as it ends up you're looking at the wrong lanes. So, we can cross that street at an angle as well as we can at right angle. This is of no concern. We could do it any way. We are looking at the Leed's property only because we were told we could not look at the Welfare Building property.

MR. HILL: Stewart, did we the Council, could get a shot at what the Market people rejected as far as knocking the corner off the Welfare Building?

MR. FISCHER: I have to defer that to Winston.

MR. HILL: I don't remember it.

MR. MARTIN: This is the first time other than the general Market plan, which the Council has seen, has been presented.

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MR. LEO MENDOZA: I have a question.

MRS. HABERMAN: Mr. Mendoza?

MR. MENDOZA: I think Mr. Eastman may want to address himself to the question of availability of space in the area. You know he referred to the fact that it would be very difficult. He may want to address himself to the point that...

MR. PADILLA: If I am in order, I would like at this time to move that we delete from this Ordinance in an attempt to move the thing forward, most of it there are no objections to and those things that are needed we need to go ahead with, with the deletion of the parcels described as 761, 762, 763 and 764 that Mr. Penner is interested in. I would like to delete the Leed's Store at this time.

MR. MARTIN: New City Block 175, Parcel 688.

MR. PADILLA: With those deletions, as further described by Mr. Martin, I would like to move that this Ordinance be approved.

MRS. HABERMAN: A motion has been made, is there a second to Councilman Padilla's motion?

MR. HILL: Yeah, I second it. This doesn't have anything to do with this particular Ordinance but then I would like for Mr. Martin, Fischer and whoever to come back and discuss this intersection of Commerce Street and Santa Rosa.

MRS. HABERMAN: Regarding the Welfare Building corner.

MR. NAYLOR: The Market planners have to be involved in that, too, because they are the ones that evidently changed this thing around.

MRS. HABERMAN: Councilmen, are you ready for the question? Call the roll, please. Actually we've only had the reading insofar as the public hearing, Item IX, is concerned. Perhaps we ought to have the official reading of X, because this is...

November 9, 1972

mg

MR. MENDOZA: How soon are we going to get a clarification on this, though, as to whether it will be worked out. Are we going to let this thing go on through?

MRS. HABERMAN: Let's say within 30 days.

MR. HILL: Well, let's give it to the City Manager and tell him...

MRS. HABERMAN: We haven't had the reading of X and actually X is what we have the motions to pass on.

MR. PADILLA: But your reading has to delete those parcels. I've actually made the motion ahead of the reading.

MR. NAYLOR: Is that IX we're talking about?

MR. HILL: Well, the public hearing is IX.

MRS. HABERMAN: And the action is X.

MR. HILL: And the action on the Ordinance is X.

MRS. HABERMAN: O.K. Jake, will you read X please. Yes, we'll declare the hearing closed at this time.

MR. GALINDO: May I ask a question from Mr. Martin, while we're talking on the points of this...

MRS. HABERMAN: Mr. Galindo, I'm sorry, but we did officially close the hearing and if you will, Mr. Martin, and or any other of the Councilmen will be happy to see you as soon as we finish some of the business.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 41459

APPROVING AND ADOPTING MAJOR AMENDMENT NO. 1  
MODIFYING URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR ROSA VERDE  
PROJECT, TEX. R-78; AND DIRECTING THAT SAID  
AMENDMENT BE FILED AS PART OF THE URBAN RENEWAL  
PLAN FOR ROSA VERDE PROJECT, TEX. R-78.

MR. PADILLA: I would like to repeat my motion, Mrs. Haberman. I would like to move the passage of this Ordinance with two deletions, one described as parcels 761, 62, 63 and 64 and the other I will describe the other deletion as the Leed's property, may I call you, Mr. Martin again for those numbers.

MR. MARTIN: Yes sir. New City Block 175 and parcel number 688.

MR. PADILLA: All right, I move that we adopt the Ordinance as amended.

MRS. HABERMAN: Motion has been made and seconded with the stated deletions. Call the roll please.

AYES: Haberman, Hill, Mendoza, Naylor, Padilla; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Becker, Hilliard, Garza, Gatti.

MR. HILL: Mrs. Haberman I would like to ask that the City Manager pick up the point that we have been discussing and as soon as he can get this staffed out with all interested agencies and individuals to report back to the City Council.

MRS. HABERMAN: Right. Mr. Mendoza and Mr. Padilla would you follow through with any questions you have during this period, because I think you have a few yet.

November 9, 1972

mg

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO.  
REQUEST FOR RATE INCREASE

Mr. W. A. Griep, Division Manager of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, appeared before the Council and read a prepared statement in which his company requested that the City permit a rate increase. (A copy of the statement was presented to each Councilman and is also included with the papers of this meeting.)

Various Council members raised questions concerning zones, capital expenses, etc., and these items were discussed with Mr. Griep.

At the conclusion of Mr. Griep's presentation, it was agreed that all information and questions should be funneled through Mr. Tom Edwards, Utility Supervisor.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Robert Rubio, Vice President of the Texas Consumer's Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed telephone rate increase. (A copy of Mrs. Rubio's statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Romulo A. Mungia, read a prepared statement opposing the proposed telephone rate increase. (A copy of the statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Mario Cantu, representing the small business community on San Antonio's Westside, spoke in protest against the proposed telephone rate increase. He asked that a public hearing on this matter be held at night so that anyone so desiring may attend.

\* \* \* \*

Councilman Alvin G. Padilla responded to comments made by Mr. Cantu regarding corrupt public officials and the fact that they are "paid off" by big business. Mr. Padilla said that he knew of no such incident and if such has occurred then anyone knowing of it should come forth and make a statement. On the other hand, he said that if persons cannot prove such statements they should refrain from making irresponsible remarks.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Bob Shehee, 12th Floor Alico Center, Waco, Texas, an attorney for San Antonio Telephone Company, spoke to the Council concerning the proposed telephone rate increase. He offered to give the Council any information his company has regarding rate hearings in other states and cities.

Mr. Dean Warfield, President of San Antonio Telephone Company, discussed some of the details concerning his company. He also spoke in opposition to the proposed rate increase.

\* \* \* \*

November 9, 1972  
img

-31-

72-50 The Clerk read the following letter:

November 3, 1972

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:

November 3, 1972

Petition of H. A. Abshier, Jr.  
requesting annexation of 15  
acres of land adjoining the City  
on the Northeast Side of Judson Road.

/s/ J. H. Inselmann  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Council,  
the meeting adjourned at 1:35 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

*John Matts*  
M A Y O R

ATTEST: *J. H. Inselmann*  
C i t y C l e r k