INTER-AGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD AT CITY HALL

ON JANUARY 22, 1975

AT 9:00 A. M.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order with the following persons present: Tom Berg, Jack Spruce, Tom Deely, Norman Hill, Benny Cantu, Robert Van Dyke, Carl White, Mel Sueltenfuss, John Schaefer, John Shields, Dick Jones, J. M. Costello, Ken Harz, Fred Barajas, and Joe Madison.

- - -

MR. TOM BERG: This meeting is succinct, direct and to the point. Has everybody got a copy of it? Meter Reading - Customer Service Collection. Give us a fundamental sketch of the result.

MR. CARL WHITE: The results are that on January the 8th we did meet with the EDP Task Force and the consultants, at which time they made their presentation. Since that period ot time, we have worked with the consultants in giving them the data that they requested pertaining to the customer service organizations in both the City Water Board and City Public Service. We spent several days with them, during this period of time, both agencies did. We do anticipate that in the near future that it's going to be a necessity to get back with them and give them further details on this. End of the report.

MR. BERG: The conclusion and recommendations is the thing I was hoping you would give. It's really the main part of that, right? Your paragraph - number three?

MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.

MR. BERG: That's really what I thought you ought to read.

MR. WHITE: Okay. It seems apparent that the consultants will have to go into greater depth in the studies. This means that both companies will have to stand ready to provide greater detail, as required. This seems to be recommendable to have personnel from both companies available if any comparative studies of the two operations is undertaken.

MR. BERG: All right. That's the way you're proceeding, right?

MR. WHITE: Okay.

MR. BERG: That's fine. Second. Everybody agreed. Joe, does that mean two, three and four is not required?

MR. JOE MADISON: Yes, sir, they we all combined.

MR. BERG: Okay. All right. Number six - Task Force report number six is Electronic Data Processing, Carl.

MR. WHITE: Let me introduce Mr. Carl Rosenthal, who is the Project Director with Systems Development Corporation, and he is to make a short presentation to the Mayor's Committee this morning.

MR. BERG: Very good. Mr. Rosenthal, nice to have you here.

January 22, 1975
msv

MR. CARL ROSENTHAL: I have copies of the presentation with me and I guess the easiest thing to do is, at the end of it, well let me pass them out to the table.

MR. BERG: All right.

MR. ROSENTHAL: We'll save some for .....

MR. BERG: While you're doing that, may I ask you to identify the, you know, your position and so on, for the record and to alert you of the fact that you will have to make yourself available to the press, if they want to ask you any questions or .....

MR. ROSENTHAL: Be happy to.

MR. BERG: So we turn the meeting over to you.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, fine. I'm Carl Rosenthal, System Development Corporation, and I'm what is called a Managing Consultant, which means that I head up various consulting projects around the country for SDC and I've been designated as Project Manager on the consolidation study for the City, County and utilities in this area.

I have with me a copy of the presentation that was given on January 8th to the task group on Data Processing. It has been revised slightly to include outlines of the various deliverable reports that was not in the original presentation because we had already spent a considerable amount of time on them, with the task group and we felt that the Mayor's Committee and the press might be more interested in seeing what the end results would be in the format and that kind of thing. There also are in here, in the presentation, several technical slides which I'll go through fairly quickly, because, again, I assume that most of the people here will not be interested in them. If you have any questions, just stop me immediately. I'm going to go through fairly quickly.

MR. BERG: This is not a very bashful group, so I'm glad you pointed that out.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Good. Let me emphasize that there are, well, let me show you first of all, the agenda that I'll use. First of all I'm going to spend just a few minutes on ....(inaudible).... review. The objectives and the deliverables, in other words what it is that the project has as its objectives and what the deliverables are. Then our plan and then the project schedule. This presentation is the first of some four presentations, and it has to do with the plan, the work plan, of the consultants, and so that's what this presentation is, our work plan and then there are other presentations, which I'll show you when we get down to the milestone, as to exactly what they are and what we'll include in them. What's the purpose of the study and this is right out of the contract - just to remind you exactly what the scope of the study is, to identify and capture savings achieved by consolidation, not by operations or improvements or that kind of thing. If we find any improvements or recommendations, we will, of course, make them available to the various departments. With that as a fringe item, we've already done a couple of small items that we've done directly to the directors of Data Processing. So, there will be these items, we'll keep a record of them but in general that's not our specific purpose in this one. The specific purpose is - can we consolidate?

Now, the deliverables are three, in nature. First of all, in Applications and Facilities report, which we are now working on - that basically is a report on Data Processing today. The second report is a Consolidation Alternatives Report, and it lists the various things that can be done, independently, to save money or improve service here in Data Processing. These various alternatives, then, are evaluated by the task group. As to those that they feel are the best, the ones that are most practical and most feasible and they are

ranked in conjunction with the consultants. Based on the set of alternatives, which appear to be feasible, a set of what I'll call scenarios are put together. A scenario is a logical group of alternatives for which a master plan is produced. I'll give you an example. A scenario might be a five year consolidation of a couple of computing centers to do certain applications with another computing center here doing something else, with certain organizational patterns that fit naturally with it and certain application patterns that fit naturally with it. You know, it's a consolidation of alternatives into a complete scenario and a generation of a master plan. The consolidation planning report will include one, two, three, four master plans for the various scenarios or group of alternatives, which appear feasible and optimum, and then it will be up to the Mayor's Committee to select the master plan we want to go ahead with. I have here outlines of the various reports. By the way, I must apologize. The actual printed reports have some typos in them. I think the typos have all been fixed, in the view graphs, but we did not have a chance to fix the actual printed material, so you'll find some differences in the slides among the printed reports and here on the view graphs, and I apologize for it.

The Applications and Facilities Report is broken up into three specific sections, because there are three specific dimensions to consolidation and the dimensions are basically hardware. In other words, the possibility of using one instead of three machines, or two instead of three machines. In other words, the actual data processing facilities and their capabilities; a description of them, hardware, what we call systems software and costs.

The second dimension in data processing applications - the possibility of combining and sending a single tax bill, sending a single utility bill, of having a single general ledger system for all the organizations. The possibility of doing this consolidation and the possible savings and benefits achieved. That's the second dimension and so we'll be describing here statistics on all the applications and about a page or two pages on the individual applications, which are major enough to warrant specific attention in terms of either work load or consolidation.

The third dimension is Organizations and People. The possibility of combination of organizations, combination of programming departments, the combination of operations departments, this kind is the third possible dimension for consolidation and so the third part of the report will describe the data processing organization and the people - chief personnel, their biographies, job descriptions and roles.

MR. BERG: Mr. Rosenthal, you intend, then, on this particular report to end up with a dollar figure as a cost benefit?

MR. ROSENTHAL: No. Well, no cost benefits, this is strictly data processing today. This is the base line. This will tell you what you are spending and how you are spending it and what organizations you have and what the costs are.

MR. BERG: So, now we know what the cost is all over.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Today.

MR. BERG: You're not at cost benefit yet?

MR. ROSENTHAL: This is not a cost benefit, this is an attempt.....

MR. BERG: Well, its study will have a cost benefit as its end result.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right. The alternatives and the plans will have cost benefits.

MR. BERG: You're not at that point with this.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right. Now, we will have here a list of the kind of benefits that the application is doing today and this is the picture of data processing in the community today. It gives you a single report that

everyone can look at and find out what is the county doing, what's the hospital doing, what's City Public Service doing, and that kind of thing, and we're going to try to put it together in a functional organization. You'll find all the billing descriptions together, all the accounts payable together, all the general ledgers together, all the DP manager resumes will be together, all the DP operations people will be together. So, you'll be able to see what's happening in each of the organizations, in a functional way. This is the result of our data gathering phase.

The next phase, of course, is the alternative generation phase and the result of that is this report. Any questions, now? This is the second report that comes out, and I'll give you the dates and everything as we go on. This is the alternative report. Here's where the cost benefits start to come in in a preliminary basis. A list of the alternative actions, a list of the scenarios which combine these alternatives into practical programs and then a set of tables and evaluations giving the cost benefits of these various alternatives and scenarios. Based on the alternatives report the task group and the Mayor's Committee will select a series of alternatives and scenarios that are to be planned, and this is a matter of ranking and finding out which is the optimum way to go. We, of course, will act as technical consultants in it. We are not going to try to act as gods in this thing and say this is the way to go. You people know the intangibles here and there is no way an outside consultant can make a final management decision. All we can do is give you the cost and the benefits and list them and attempt to help you come through it.

Based on your selection of the alternatives and scenarios that make sense in San Antonio, we will then produce the Consolidation Planning Report and the Consolidation Planning Report fundamentally has a series of alternative master plans, an introduction summary, and a list of the study reports. Let me show you what the master plans look like which is, of course, the only really interesting part of it. Each of the selected master plans, and I assume that will probably be about three master plans produced, it's hard to say exactly how many today. Probably one of them will be what I'll call base line - significant in or improvements to the way things are now. What it would look like, what the cost will be, what the benefits will be of staying the way you are but with whatever improvements the technology and techniques can give. There will be at least one alternative probably, which is an intergration of everything in an attempt to save as much money as surely possible in pure consolidation with the cost of conversion and the problems involved in it and then there will probably be combinations or intermediate levels that makes sense and so there's an over view, the objectives, rational and impact, the technical approach plan and the management approach plan, economic analysis and limitation plan and the people in the whole DP system that goes in on it.

MR. TOM DEELY: You've just indicated, I believe, that you felt that by your statement that you believed that it would be cheaper to put everything in one group.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, I didn't say that. I said that one of the scenarios will probably be that because the RFP and the contract requests us to. Whether it will be cheaper or not we don't know yet because we don't have the costs. I think it is one of the alternatives that has got to be evaluated. It is the one that has a tremendous amount of appeal from a technology point of view. Whether it has that same appeal from an economic and administrative and personnel point of view is not as apparent. Okay? We will try to show all these various dimensions and give everybody an opportunity to find out, you know, the way it really should be done. The RFP does specifically call for us to include certain alternatives, and so I have mentioned two of the alternatives that the RFP requires us to put in. There is no reason why the task group, though, in doing its evaluations and looking at the preliminary costs benefits that we've come up cannot decide under mutual consent, and say, "Hey, although the RFP says you're supposed to do it, it doesn't make sense. Let's go with another alternative that makes better sense," and hopefully, we'll do that and come up and that there will be no plans produced that are not realistic. I, for one, do not

feel that it's to anybody's benefit just because the RFP says, such and such an alternative is to be planned, that we should do it if in the light of further research it appears not to be feasible. Okay?

Here's our work plan - I'll go through it quickly because this is much more of interest to the technical coordinators then it is really to the Mayor's Committee. We have data requirements and data gathering guidelines. Let me just put them through and show them to you. The requirements, the data requirements fit exactly into the same pattern as the original report having to do with applications, installations and personnel organizations. We took these data requirements and broke them up into five tasks. There are five members in a team and we took one person and assigned him to the problem of personnel organization and assigned one person to the problem of data processing installation and then three of the members of the task group were assigned two applications because it is the biggest data gathering area, so three of the teams have been going around. We arbitrarily broke the applications into three areas. The areas were broken up into these three not because they logically fit but because of the quality of work loads because we wanted to give each of the three people approximately the same amount of work and actually the person who has revenue - oriented applications only has a list of about four applications. Everybody else has about 20, but his applications are the big ones, taxation and billing, expenditure, oriented finance administration. So, those were the five jobs and we assigned these jobs to the members of the team, as follows.

Fundamentally, Gil Dawson who has the installation is our technology person. I'm the management type and the other three are the application systems engineering types and that's the way the team is constituted. It was done that way because we knew the way the assignments were going to pick up. I'll go very quickly through this. Data processing applications - data in getting that information. Here are the objectives and the factors that were needed, cost benefits and requirements of consolidation and I have here the interview guides that we used in getting material which, again, I don't think is appropriate to spend a lot of time on. There in the task group we spent a lot of time on this chart which actually you'll notice we already had done some notes on the chart and that kind of thing. I should have erased it, really. The various levels of consolidation that are possible by organization and one of the task group members mentioned that it was a pleasure to see that two of the organizations did not have to consolidate, so if you don't mind, make sure that they did. Then, of course, there was data processing facilities and the objectives and the ....(inaudible).... that are required for it. An example of the conversion costs matrix, the kind of thing that will be generated showing the organization and the application and the conversion costs, the various things and then an interview guide. Again, for the DP installation definitions and then include it in the material you have - the personnel resources. Now, I should, maybe, mention here that we actually are breaking out the personnel and the organizations into three areas. The Systems Analyst Design and Planning which is the role of producing information systems, not data processing systems design and then the programming which is the programming and systems design of the data processing systems and then the operations, capabilities and requirements. We're keeping these separate for several reasons of one of which is that one of the very highly controversial items in the country today is the separation of systems analysts from the data processing organization. It's a very highly controversial - some companies are doing it one way, some are doing it another. The City has a systems analyst group and so, we're going to give you the pro's and con's of that and talk about the organiational alternatives that do that kind of thing. So, that's why they're split apart into several groups. Here, again, is an organizational interviewing guide and a job interviewing guide for individual people and then, of course, there is the project schedule. Now, the project schedule, phase one was completed on January 8, when we made this presentation. So, there-

fore, the remaining thing to do for Phase 2, 3, 4 and 5 - Phase 2 being Data Collection, which is what we're in now. Right now, we're in the middle of the data collection thing. The next one is alternatives identification and it's in a sense, the creative portion of the entire consultant job. It's working with your people and with our team, the generation of alternatives and the estimation of preliminary cost benefits.

The third phase is taking these rankings of the various alternatives and putting them into scenarios and writing master plans for them. The fourth - the fifth phase is coming back here and making presentations like this through the various boards and the various people of interest. Then I have the detailed schedule week-by-week showing what we're doing, where we're going to be, whether we're going to be in San Antonio, whether we're going to be in Santa Monica, and I don't think there's any reason to go through these in detail. There's a chart here of phase 2 which is data collection analysis. There's a chart here for the alternative identification and, of course, the one thing I did want to mention is that our intention when we have the various alternatives and the cost benefits to come in and make a presentation to the various boards and directors of the City, the County, and utilities, etc. We would very much like to if it would be convenient during the week of March 10 - 14, to meet with the Mayor's Committee. I don't know what your schedule is in terms of meetings, but I'd like to propose that sometime during that week the Mayor's Committee have a meeting so that we can come in and give you the presentation and have some sort of discussion on the alternatives.

MR. BERG: Joe, we ought to put that down that we need to write everybody while we're on it.

MR. ROSENTHAL: What day do you normally meet on?

MR. BERG: Well, Tuesday is a preferred date - Tuesday.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, why don't we.....

MR. BERG: I don't know what day in the week that would be.

MR. ROSENTHAL: That would be March 11.

MR. BERG: Could we tentatively then fix March 11 for - any objection to the March 11th as a tentative date for the presentation? That would be here?

MR. ROSENTHAL: That would be right here in this room to the Mayor's Committee.

MR. BERG: That would be a Tuesday, the Mayor's Committee on Tuesday, March 11.

MR. DEELY: Would this also include, at this time, a presentation to the individual boards?

MR. ROSENTHAL: No, no, that we assume we would do during that week at their discretion at - when they want it.

MR. DEELY: That's what I mean, March 10 through 14.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right, we'll make ourselves available. In fact, we will try, and we use the coordinators and the task groups to try to set up meetings with the various boards, so we can get in and spend some time with each of them on exactly the way things look, and.....

MR. BERG: Would it not be more effective to have the various boards meet at the same time as the Mayor's Committee, so that we may be a lot of people, but you're going to go through the same thing.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, there is a concept of sub-optimization and optimization. There's a concept of freedom of discussion among, you know, there are things which are to the benefit of the City, and things which are to benefit the County and things which will be to the benefit of City Public Service, and things which are to the benefit of the total community, and it's nice to know what they are and be able to discuss them among yourselves.

MR. BERG: I'd like to address myself to that very question, which you're just raising now. Earlier, in your discussion, Mr. Rosenthal, you said that the group or the committee that you're working with may address themselves to the RP, request for purchase, on the basis that it, as the document says, well, we want you to address yourselves to consolidation, and if you find that's not what you should do, then you're not going to address yourself.

MR. ROSENTHAL: No, no, I didn't say that. There are specific consolidation alternatives, which are called out in the RFP, as requiring master plans.

MR. BERG: Yes.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, what I'm saying is they may turn out where we set up the various alternatives, that the specific two alternatives that are listed in the RFP turn out not to be optimum of the group of three that you want to do. And, therefore, it would be within the option of the task group and the various boards to decide, "Hey, let's do these three alternatives, because they're the ones that make sense."

MR. BERG: Yeah, yes.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, now all of them have to do with consolidation. We are not going outside of our consolidation area.

MR. BERG: Okay, what I wanted to address myself to was the fact that I gather from what you said that you would then move to do something other than what the Request for Purchase states, and I would say that you cannot do that.

MR. ROSENTHAL: No, no, all I'm saying here is that we might.....

MR. BERG: You can expand from it, but you have to address yourself specifically and answer the questions stated on that Request for Purchase.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: I'm talking about one specific little section in the RFP.....

MR. BERG: All right.

MR. ROSENTHAL: .....which says that the Alternatives Planning Report shall present such and such and such and such and such and such, and shall include at least the following two alternatives.

MR. BERG: All right. You may have alternatives three and four.

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's right.

MR. BERG: But what I'm saying is that you should address yourself and answer the first two alternatives stated in the purchase.

MR. ROSENTHAL: We will.

MR. BERG: Okay.

MR. ROSENTHAL: In the Alternatives Planning Report.

MR. BERG: I don't think it came clear to me that that's what you were going to do.

MR. ROSENTHAL: What I'm saying is those two alternatives will be in here.

MR. BERG: All right.

MR. ROSENTHAL: It may turn out that the group here, as a group, says that there are three alternatives which make sense, that those three alternatives do not include one of the two that's in the RFP.

MR. BERG: Well, that's all right. That's going beyond what the original.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's right. But they will all be in here.

MR. BERG: You've clarified my question. It came to me that you were going to bypass.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: No. No. No.

MR. BERG: And I was going to say to you that you would have to abide by specifically what the purchase requires you to do and then go beyond that as you see.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to do that, I meant.....

MR. BERG: Well, we've clarified it.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.

MR. BERG: I would like to also say that - and gentlemen - and John Schaefer, Chairman of the Water Board just came in - the.....

MR. JOHN SCHAEFER: Include me in the "gentlemen," Tom, please.

MR. BERG: I'm pinch-hitting for the Mayor, who's been detained.

MR. _____: Are you going to be the next Mayor?

MR. BERG: No. No, thank you. No, what I was going to say was this - that while it may appear that different boards have different ideas and different internal objectives, basically they are all trying to do the same thing.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right.

MR. BERG: And our goal is still the same goal. It would seem to me, and that's why I said I'd like other people to comment, that it would be far better for us to meet at one time, with all the boards, rather than to have separate meetings, because you then end up with different ideas and then at some time they've all got to come together.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's true.

MR. BERG: .....and be talked about.

MR. ROSENTHAL: But the group is so large, that it's impractical for productive work.

MR. SCHAEFER: Let me make an observation. Perhaps what we need to think about is a sequence that week, perhaps it might be better if the presentation were made to the individual boards, before there was a coming together of this group. Now, the meeting of this group should be, you know, orientation of what you found and not a lot of heavy decision-making required. But it seems to me that, in a sense, there's an awkwardness in this group getting together before they've had a chance to discuss the whole thing and sound out their own boards. So, perhaps, we're talking about boards early in the week and this meeting Friday or something like that. It's just a thought.

MR. BERG: Anybody else want to comment? Carl?

MR. WHITE: That was the thing that I mentioned, I think, that has

some merit, that the boards themselves might want to pass this thing around and discuss it a little bit more than, perhaps, that you would in the Mayor's Committee, I don't know, some.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: I think the optimum thing to do would be to have this meeting maybe on Friday, or Thursday, and have an opportunity for the boards who are interested to get a chance to have the presentation and to talk about it on Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday, and that probably would be the optimum thing to do.

MR. BERG: You're expecting a decision from these meetings. To give you directions to proceed.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: Technically no - the contract gives you ten days to select the alternatives that are to be planned.....

MR. BERG: All right.

MR. ROSENTHAL: .....from the presentation, and, therefore.....

MR. BERG: Well, then you are expecting a decision?

MR. ROSENTHAL: A decision within ten days.....

MR. BERG: .....from the date of the presentation.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's right. That's right.

MR. ROBERT VAN DYKE: Okay. Tom, I was going to say that the fuel boards do not have, normally, an opportunity to come and be present at our consolidation meetings, and I think there is some merit in having a session earlier in the week, where the various members of each board would have an opportunity to become acquainted with the results and then in our case, Chairman Schaefer and I, would be here at the mass meeting of the consolidation committee, and we'd be in the position to pass on any thoughts that might come from other people in the board and if you have the combined meeting first, then those other members don't have that opportunity.

MR. BERG: Except they would hear the discussion between the various boards.....

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, that's true.

MR. BERG: .....and perhaps expand their discussion, and would enlighten them. Then, Tom, you feel that there ought to be separate board meetings.

MR. DEELY: I sort of feel the board ought to hear this out first and then have separate meetings, then have this meeting here and then if we could talk, like.....

MR. BERG: All right. Okay. All right. The consensus seems to be then, you all, if we could then ask the individual boards then to meet early in the week, we could not meet on Thursday, because that's City Council day, so it would have to be Friday or Wednesday. I don't know - is Friday a good time for everybody?

MR. JOE MADISON: Thursdays are the best days for the Council. We could schedule that for a "B" Session for Council, for them to hear it.

MR. BERG: On Friday?

MR. MADISON: On Thursday.

MR. BERG: On Thursday.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Is Friday morning or Friday afternoon the best?

MR. BERG: No, morning, I think is the best.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Friday morning. Let's tentatively then or firmly set it up as the 14th.

MR. BERG: All right. That would mean then, the various boards would meet at their pleasure earlier in the week and.....

MR. DEELY: Just so the schedule does not conflict between your board, Water Board.....

MR. BERG: How long would this take - this presentation by you people?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, I'll tell you, if the discussion is on the level that I think it will be, it's going to take all morning. These alternatives are very controversial. A lot of the benefits and problems are non-qualifyable into direct hours.

MR. DEELY: Very, very complex.

MR. ROSENTHAL: One of two things can happen. You can just make the presentation, everybody sits there. I don't know, and it goes through in a half an hour. And then everybody comes in and gives their opinion and what's best and how they should be ranked and it takes all morning.

MR. DEELY: So, that's the question.

MR. ROSENTHAL: My forecast will be, based on prior experience, we'll be lucky to have lunch. The last time I was at one of these things, it went straight through lunch and everybody just sat here until they had to leave, you know. So.....

MR. DEELY: Mr. Rosenthal, you would also anticipate that the data processing information services people would be in this meeting.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: Absolutely. It would be a joint presentation of the task group members and ourselves. I'm not going to let the task group members get away without saying a few words at the individual board meetings.

MR. BERG: What's this on, the 14th or is that going to be.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, at the individual board meetings, at least the DP people from that specific organization would be there in force.

MR. BERG: Yes. I would think so, too.

MR. ROSENTHAL: I'm sure they will be.

MR. WHITE: I want to point out, too, Carl, I know that you alluded to this point or two, that you're actually working for this EDP Committee.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right.

MR. WHITE: And all during this time-frame that he's got up here on the board, our committee, which is composed of John Shields, Carl Rosenthal, Jim Hannan and several others, our committee will, at various stages along the line, be making, at least, decisions among the committee.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Right. In fact this two-week period, here, is really a set of iterations into this presentation. In other words, the creation of the alternatives is here. This is the validation screening set up with the task group and then, hopefully, on the 28th at the latest, we will all say, well, this is the way we're going to go in terms of a formal presentation. We'll go back, set up the formal slides and get the material written before the presentation and then come back and make the presentation. This is where you will be working very heavily with the task group, and that's why the task group analysis will determine alternatives as specifically shown in the chart.

MR. BERG: Okay. Where we're leaving it now is set up for March 14th at 9:00 A.M. for the Mayor's Committee to meet in special session for this report of the task group on the Electronic Data Processing, and individual boards will meet prior to that at separate meetings.

MR. DEELY: Yes, we'd like to ask for the Tuesday morning.....

MR. BERG: Yes. I cannot do it on a Monday. All my Mondays are tied up. From CPS standpoint, I have to meet Tuesday morning; I prefer Tuesday morning, March 11. I don't know about the Water Board. I can come over and see you that afternoon.

MR. ROSENTHAL: March 11, morning, will be CPS.

MR. BERG: Will that be your regular board meeting day?

MR. VAN DYKE: We're going to try to get them that same day.....

MR. BERG: Well, we'd be in the morning.....

MR. SCHAEFER: That will be fine with me, if you are all on schedule, why don't you finish up and we'll meet from then on.

MR. BERG: Okay, in other words, you are hoping we won't keep them longer than three hours, because.....

MR. SCHAEFER: I had one other thought, perhaps during that ten-day period, there will be a need develop to get the boards together, for their collective, after this other sequence has unfolded.

MR. BERG: I think there's a lot of collective wisdom there.

MR. SCHAEFER: Two heads are thicker than one.

MR. BERG: Moves slower.

MR. DEELY: By that time, the board would have had a separate discussion, we would have met together with the technicians and then if there's any need to bring the board.....

MR. SCHAEFER: Tom, if you won't have a task group, how about, why don't we just get the boards together for lunch. You all can meet in the morning, then we'll have lunch together. By that time you all would have digested some of what you've put over on us. We'll have lunch and then you all can put it over on us.

MR. ROSENTHAL: The City meets Thursday mornings, is that correct?

MR. BERG: Every Thursday.

MR. ROSENTHAL: So, would you normally have anyone know whether it be the morning or the afternoon?

MR. MADISON: It'd be in the afternoon. No way in the morning.

MR. ROSENTHAL: In the afternoon. So, I'll show the City then, as Thursday afternoon. Now, we need the County.

MR. BERG: We'll be working with Judge Reeves.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: I have just a few more slides, and then I'll sit down. I just wanted to show you that the next stage, of course, is the planning stage, when we actually write the final report. These are some of the alternatives that have been selected and then present the report and make a final item, which, of course, is reported, which would come in here.....

MR. BERG: May I interrupt you, Mr. Rosenthal? Is the presentation you gentlemen plan to give to the individual boards going to be identical or..... It is going to be identical.....

MR. ROSENTHAL: They will be identical in form, if not in substance.

MR. BERG: Fine.

MR. SCHAEFER: Let's do this, Tom, really, let me interject this. Why don't we meet, your board and the Water Board, after all we have the biggest computers, the two of us.

MR. BERG: Well, you see that..... I'm going back to my original thought, again.....

MR. SCHAEFER: Why don't we have that on Tuesday morning and plan a lunch afterwards, where we can sit down and.....

MR. BERG: .....and I'll treat you to lunch.....

MR. SCHAEFER: Well, that's great. I accept.

MR. DEELY: There's going to be a lot of questions that are going to be raised, that I'm not so sure that meeting together, questions that are going to be raised and the presentations that are going to be made by the data processing people on the board; it seems to me that you're going to get a conflict on these things, because the trade off on these things, there are disadvantages and advantages, as pointed out by Mr. Rosenthal, so.....

MR. BERG: Well, I agree that there are. That's why I keep coming back, frankly, to the fact that we ought to be together, because I think each ought to hear the trade-offs and each ought to hear the areas of contention, because it's got to come out some time. .....I think if they're in the one room, they all hear it, they're all going to talk the same language, you know.....

MR. DEELY: Absolutely.

MR. BERG: Well, why put it off.

MR. ROSENTHAL: I can just tell you.

MR. BERG: I've been through this road a dozen times in my own business career with operating factories in different parts of the country. I remember one time we had 15 major offices and warehouses, each with its own computer. We were going to consolidate it, all back in New Jersey, you know, no office could run without it, but we did. We ran better. But, you do that now with central collections. You deposit.....you would never thought a company would send a check to a bank in a different city. Well, they do. You know, for lock-box arrangements. So, I really feel - I would feel happier and more comfortable, frankly, if we all met together and I know that there are going to be a lot of people that will say, "Well the Water Board and the CPS have got different views and so does the transit and so does the hospital, you know. If they do, let's do a serious job of selling you or you sell us, you know, either or both.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, that we're going to do - all the boards meet together first.

MR. BERG: That's the way I started out, but you see I was shot down. I was shot down on most of my suggestions.

MR. ROSENTHAL: If I can make just one comment based on prior experience. If the big meeting is say first, then each of the individual organizations will still want to see what final presentation is like before they walk in there. So, that they can put their thoughts together and get their ideas and know what the solution is. And all that will happen then is that if, for instance, the big meeting - Monday of that week, the prior Thursday and Friday, we'll come in and make the presentations to the various boards, because it's just, you know, it's just human nature, before you go into a big meeting to want to know what's going to be said and whay my position is going to be on various items, and, therefore, I think we should bow to human nature and allow each of the boards to be briefed ahead of time.

MR. BERG: Yes, but we're doing that you see, because they're going to be briefed and I think also, John, your meeting with your board in the afternoon, if we all meet together in the morning, you know, we're going to think about different things on Wednesday and Thursday. You're going to be talking to your guys in your own board meetings that afternoon. You're all going to have some thoughts and it will germinate along - what you agree or disagree with in the morning or that afternoon or the next day, we may disagree on, you know. So, I think there's going to be a benefit in talking together at one time. Why not? It all depends on how you comb your hair. Some part it on the left and some part it on the right and others don't have any part.

MR. SCHAEFER: What you're talking about is the.....we're talking about our two boards. We're talking about a dozen people, not, you know, each group.

MR. BERG: Okay, are you going to meet separately or are you going to meet with us? Transit Board, do you want to meet with us or are you going to meet separately?

MR. BENNIE CANTU: We're supposed to be listeners primarily. We'll meet with any group that will have us, I think. I think we all ought to meet together. All the three utilities, let's meet together. Let's get this behind us, you know. Here we're jumping from one side to another and we'll listen, too. We are still three utilities involved in this thing anyway you look at it. We might not be in the data process of this thing, but let's do it together.

MR. BERG: How many members on your board?

MR. CANTU: Four.

MR. BERG: Self-perpetuating?

MR. CANTU: No, we're not that lucky.

MR. BERG: You're not that lucky. All kidding aside, however, why can't we do that on the 11th? Let's set it up that way, if that's okay.....

MR. SCHAEFER: In the morning?

MR. BERG: In the morning. Yes. What time shall we say? 9 o'clock. March 11.

MR. SCHAEFER: Tom, that's the three boards?

MR. BERG: Right.

MR. VAN DYKE: Now, Tom, where do you suggest? Do you have a place at the Public Service Board? As you know, we have a good training room where we can meet.....

MR. BERG: Tom Deely, what would be your thought on that, as to the practicality of where to meet?

MR. DEELY: We will have a big meeting also - I think we should come - remember.....

MR. BERG: Pardon me.

MR. DEELY: We will have, at this meeting, also.....

MR. BERG: All the EDP people.

MR. DEELY: Yes. We have space for it. Whatever your pleasure is.

MR. BERG: Pardon me.

MR. DEELY: I said Van probably has more comfortable facilities over at the Water Board. I wouldn't think it would make much difference.

MR. DEELY: We got a room. You know where our room is - over on the seventh floor.

MR. BERG: Well, I thought that was not going to be big enough to handle all these many people.

MR. DEELY: Oh, yes.

MR. BERG: It doesn't matter to me and you fellows know your facilities. What's your pleasure on that, Tom?

MR. DEELY: It's immaterial to me. It doesn't matter to me. We would be glad to host it. We don't have fancy offices like you do, Van. We're poor boys.

MR. SCHAEFER: You know, we have to have some place where we can turn the lights off.

MR. VAN DYKE: We do have some things to compensate for being your poor cousins, but our facilities are available, if yours are not though. All right.

MR. BERG: We'll work that out. It would seem to me that we ought to meet, probably, at the most - the place that's got the most comfortable room and where we can have some lunch later on. Now, you've got a board meeting, happening, what, at 2 o'clock. Something like that?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, 3:30.

MR. BERG: 3:30. .....(Inaudible).....

MR. VAN DYKE: And, so it would be at the training room then, at the City Water Board offices, first floor. We'll have a lunch arranged for you after that.

MR. SCHAEFER: One thing about it, Mr. Rosenthal really needs to understand and we're really trying to do this together in that if there are problems then, that come up within any of these particular areas between the Tuesday meeting and the Friday meeting, then we can again get together with staff to iron some of these things out.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, we're available the entire week.....

MR. BERG: It will have to be done within that ten-day period he's talking about in the contract. So, undoubtedly, there will have to be, you know, CPS, these people, everybody's going to get their own staff together and tear it apart, put it together again and, you know, standard procedure.

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's right.

MR. BERG: Okay. Let's go.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, and then, well, the rest of the thing - I just.....

MR. BERG: Are you on schedule?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, well, let me very quickly just show you a summary of the milestones. These are the various deliverables, and the anticipated dates. Here are the different areas, the approaching plans, which are the ones we're doing now. Applications and services presentation and report, consolidational alternatives presentation report, etc. And those are the approximate dates for them. Those are the deliverables based on this schedule. This is when we think everything will be available.

MR. BERG: Any questions?

MR. ROSENTHAL: There's a couple of summary charts here, but I don't think they're really relevant to it. These were used just for discussion purposes. The very last chart is an interesting one in that it is an attempt at redefining some of the words that we're using. Just for - so that we all understand that the kind of material and the kind of information that's going to be given. The key, of course, is the alternative and the trick in generating alternatives is to make them independent of each other, so if you have, let's say, 20 alternatives, if two or three of the alternatives are closely coupled, what you do with one determines what you do with the other. They're not really separate alternatives. They're single alternatives. And, so, the whole trick of generating alternatives is the combination of them, of dependent ones, into single alternatives that are independent and have a continuing of decisions. You know, all the way from totally separate to totally together, to various points on the continuing that makes sense. And, so, you generate these alternatives, which are independent action continuing. For example, an independent action would continually be convert all of your DP to a single computer. This is an alternative. It has a lot of things that go with it, in terms of organizational, and everything else. Then, when you combine these alternatives into a plan, you have a scenario, as we call it, which is an integrated pattern of alternatives, for example, a five phase integration plan for DP utilities, which actually is built on that alternative, would have an organizational personnel impacts. And, so, and then below that, of course, are the factors which you use to evaluate an alternative. And then below that, of course, is the data. The actual knowledge of application computer course. And, so, this is the material - this is what we're working on now, this is what we'll be working on the next period and then, in the final period, we'll be generating these alternatives, scenarios, for master plans. And the real problem is the generation of scenarios, you know, what are the three or four scenarios that make sense for San Antonio. That, you know, that should be planned.

MR. BERG: Well, the decision will be based on cost benefit after you get through with it.

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's right.

MR. BERG: Very good.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay. That basically is.....

MR. BERG: Any questions of Mr. Rosenthal? I thank you very much and appreciate your detailed presentation. We'll look forward to getting together with you on March 11th and that week. Next there'll be a - Mr. Costello on Personnel.

MR. JACK COSTELLO: Mr. Chairman. Since the last meeting of the Mayor's Committee, our Task Force has had two rather lengthy meetings. We have gotten into longer meetings and fewer of them. At these meetings, we went through three different items that we're working on, and I have to admit that we haven't come to many conclusions. We have on-going projects. One is the investigation of the feasibility of a self-insurance for medical hospitalization programs of the City agencies. There's considerable data that has to be gathered, and we find that there are a number of other utilities that have this type of coverage and we're investigating and getting information on their experience and how it's being handled. Then on the coordination of the agencies regarding general wage increases or changes in working conditions, we are gathering information on these. We've taken the approach that we'll try to find the items that are common to all the agencies, such as in the job classification, one of these is the labor type jobs and we're looking at the job tasks rather than the job titles, because we find that this is a way in which we can achieve the best comparability and these are significant in the fact that we have had some requests from various union organizations to the City Water Board, the Bexar County Hospital District, for minimum wage of $3.17 per hour. This, of course, would have an impact on other agencies, so we're looking into this to be able to give some guidance and information to the various agencies. The development and the analysis of the fringe benefits, cost data for each of the agencies is still in process. We retrenched a little bit and decided that we will try to use 1974 data, because of the fact that up through last November all we had was 1973 data and there were too many changes in the costs of the various items. We've had some problems in just defining the terms, and I'd like to point out in the report, there's one - possibly it's an oversimplification there, and my apologies to Mr. Hill and Mr. Cantu. They mentioned there that overtime that's not required for the operators until they work 48 hours. That's a little oversimplified. This really applies to the men on the extra..... (inaudible).....or operators too, but it's one of the extremes. Actually, the contract with the employees dictates one overtime provision, while the law sets up another. So, in order to not violate either one, records of individuals are kept. And, so, 40 hours is not really a standard, common with the other agencies. This is important in looking at the comparability again. Now, in the coming weeks, we're going to complete - try to get the completion of these analyses. We're also looking at the fact that we feel, that as a Task Force, we have some responsibility in looking at the kinds of labor legislation that is likely to develop in this session, in Austin, and we're concerned that there isn't enough information being put in to give the management side of the story on some of these pieces of legislation. We want to contact the Governor's Committee, which looked into this and has come up with some data or we're not sure what they've come up with yet, until we get it from them, and then we would look and see what should be - what we would like to see put in there - and we would have it checked out with our various boards and administrators, prior to making this known. But we think this is one of the things that possibly we would make a significant contribution down the road and that's about all we have for now.

MR. BERG: You've got your work cut out for you. Thank you very much. This requires a lot of thought and to do it slowly, I think, you'd get yourself in a real jam. Contradictions, if you move too quickly on some of these difficult problems here. I guess your board or your group recognizes that.

MR. SCHAEFER: Tom, I was wondering if anybody in this group was tracking legislation very carefully through the Texas Municipal League or anybody else. There are roughly 2,400 bills that we expect to be introduced and do any of us have a service where we can track the bills that are of concern to us?

MR. BERG: I don't know.

MR. VAN DYKE: We do. The Legislative Service, and the Texas Water Conservation Association also provides it to us, so.....

MR. BERG: What you're saying is somebody gets the bills and somebody's looking at them and somebody's responding to them. Is that all? You're inquiring if someone is responding to them, really?

MR. SCHAEFER: Well, yes, we just wanted to also, you know, alerting us that there are bills which could affect us.....

MR. MADISON: I want to make one statement in that regard. You know, for the first time the City is going to have a representative, a paid representative, one of our legal staff, Louis Garcia, who has got an apartment up there and he's actually going to move up there and live with the legislature.

MR. BERG: Does he have to register as a lobbyist?

MR. WHITE: Yes, he does and he has to file reports and all that kind of thing. But he may be able to give some of your agencies some assistance. He's up there on a full-time basis, and he's looking out after the City of San Antonio interest, not just, you know, not just City of San Antonio, but everybody.

MR. BERG: Would it be of some benefit to sometime have him come in and just give this Committee a report of what he sees and does up there?

MR. WHITE: It could be very appropriate. Yes, sir.

MR. VAN DYKE: It would be a good idea to have a brief report from him at every one of our monthly meetings, while the legislature is in session.

MR. BERG: Because there could be some trends, as he sees it, you know, as long as we're paying him as lobbyist, we ought to know what's going on.

MR. DEELY: I don't know what he's watching, Carl, or what his instructions are, but is he also looking into bills that might affect the various City agencies, as well as.....

MR. WHITE: Let me say it this way, if he's not, he should be. Maybe that would be a benefit for him to appear at this group and make it known, very clear to him, you know what I mean, make it very clear to him that we are expecting him to also look after your interests. He's just getting started, this is his first week up there. We might say we find it more to our advantage to visit with him directly, which we plan to do. We've done this in the past with other representatives, not of this City necessarily, but our problems are different, unique and often they're disguised and hidden.....(inaudible).....and I'm sure that's true with other agencies.

205

MR. DICK JONES: Yes. in Housing, for example, they're flocking in from every direction and, you know.....American History said that while the legislators are in session, nobody is safe. Well, lots of the things are.....and we're interested in pushing them along. There's also the possibility of negative legislation, getting introduced when you're talking about the 2,400 to 3,000 bills in.....

MR. BERG: Just a matter of those fellows reading them and understanding them is mammoth itself. Mr. Rosenthal, I was going to suggest you may have something more valuable than listen to the remainder of this meeting. If you care to, you're invited to stay; if you have to leave, please feel free to leave and you be your judge.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, anything having to do with consolidation is interesting and of concern to me.

MR. BERG: We'd be glad to have you here the rest of it. Absolutely. Let's go on then to.....(inaudible).....Maintenance. Mr. Barajas, do you want to give us a verbal report, to keep things moving along?

MR. FRED BARAJAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen of the Task Force, I might mention that my Committee's assignment has been completed, and it was completed when we took over the administration control as of the first of November of last year. This verbal report is merely to let you know and apprise you of some of the things that we are doing, and I have a brief report here. It's strictly for your information. I might back up a little bit and say that one of the items that we ran across that was given the largest problem in the various maintenance facilities of the City was the police garage and that, in turn, was resulting - there were inefficiencies resulting from the Police Department, which was something that has been growing, and it was a procedure that they have been following for years and, as you know, when you start looking at procedures and because you've been doing it this - all the years - it's time to look at it a different way. In fact, we were interested enough to take a trip to Austin and visit the Austin Police Department, which, of course, was the closest one to us, of any size, and we found out that they were operating exactly like our local San Antonio Police Department, as far as reporting their defects on police cars and assignments and lack of parking space. They were parking on the streets out there, around the Police Station, although it is a fairly new facility. And one of the things that has been accomplished since our taking over - I may dwell just a moment on the Police Department - the parking lot is comprising now of more than one acre of parking space and it's very near completion. We have pointed this out to the City Manager and action was taken with other agencies of the City. It will be a shelter, when it's completed. A shelter will be provided for the Police Department and located on this lot, so that the cars may be assigned on the site. Upon completion of this lot, several changes of procedure will be made jointly by the Police Department and the police garage to insure optimum results. I might state here that in the past the policeman was looking all over the lot for his automobile. He couldn't find it. They were stealing each other's automobiles. And it's - there was no specific assignment of police cars and this has been fairly remedied, and it will improve as time goes on. The result is that no one knew how many police cars were actually available for service and how many were not available. And, we availed them of this and we've gotten splendid cooperation from the top Chief of the Police Department and the inspectors and - to where they're working very closely with us and these things are not accomplished overnight, but we've made some terrific progress, and we feel real good about it. The man

hours that were wasted, not so much in the garage, but the Police Department, looking for cars. Sometimes men were 45 minutes late getting out on their assignments, because they couldn't find their transportation. So, these are things that we've been working with and actually when you - we correct these, why the production of the police garage will naturally go up. The area satellites are showing improvement. Although we still are short some personnel throughout the entire garage - I shall say the satellites, as well as the Victoria and the police garage - we are still about six people short, and these are not people that have to be added because of increased work, as they are vacancies that haven't even been filled. We're going to work with the City Personnel and see about filling these vacancies.

The Fire Department's main division, presently hampered by lack of parking space and working space, and should have new facilities complete in about three months. Once in this new shop, many changes can be made with the primary goal of reducing down time on fire fighting equipment and in working with the City Automotive Operation personnel. Many procedures and results have been evaluated with necessary changes and adjustments being made. While seemingly small in some cases, each of these undertakings will serve to improve the quality of or to reduce the frequency of maintenance. City Automotive Operation has been responsible for several contributions. Each serving to improve maintenance divisions. Thank you, sir.

MR. BERG: Very interesting. Thank you. Well, it's nice to have such fine progress and identifiable so soon. Thank you, Mr. Barajas. Let's see, Microfilm, John Shields. John.

MR. JOHN SHIELDS: As I mentioned at the last meeting, Mr. Chairman, we were going to contact the National Archives and Records Service. We found the gentleman that was responsible, one that we had the name of originally retired in the interim, but I talked with Mr. Lamb, and he is willing to make two of his record specialists available to the City, provided that we would bear the cost of the - the transportation costs and the per diem. He says due to the very severe restrictions that have placed on Federal Government employees, up until the 30th of June they have no travel funds, and he indicated that he would be happy to send two people down to San Antonio, at a total cost not to exceed about $400. This will be $25 a day, but two people, rather $50 a day for two people, plus the 15 cents a mile from the trip from Fort Worth to San Antonio. If it's agreeable with the Mayor's Committee, we'll be happy to go ahead and proceed and ask Mr. Lamb to provide us these two individuals, to make a preliminary study and to make recommendations to the City and its agencies and to the County, as to the scope and purpose and the plan for a total records management program for these agencies. I'd like to recommend to the Mayor's Committee that we proceed with this and that we be authorized to further contact Mr. Lamb and make arrangements to have these two people come down early in February.

MR. BERG: Any questions?

MR. SCHAEFER: Mr. Shields, the way I understand this, we would share the total costs between the agencies that are involved.

MR. BERG: You've got a recommendation - $80 per agency here.

MR. SHIELDS: Not to exceed $80 per agency.

MR. VAN DYKE: I'd so move.

MR. BERG: Questions? Tom Deely, do you have a question about this?

MR. DEELY: No questions.

MR. BERG: Pinky, is that all right with you? Can you afford $80?

MR. NORMAN HILL: Yes. We can talk to Charlie.

MR. SHIELDS: I think it'd be very worthwhile, I mean, inasmuch as - probably with the possible exception of City Public Service, we do not have any records managers really, as such, in other of the agencies. We need this expert guidance.

MR. BERG: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. (?) : Second.

MR. BERG: All right. All in favor.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: (In unison) AYE.

MR. BERG: Okay. You have the authority to proceed.

MR. SHIELDS: Thank you, sir.

MR. BERG: Thank you, John.

MR. WHITE: John, would you explain this. I've been reading this $2,500 standard fee cost to Mr. Lamb after the preliminary report.

MR. SHIELDS: No, actually, after they present their report and the plan for a records management program to each of the agencies, they do have the capability of providing technical service to the agencies, if the agency desires it. Their standard fee, and he's indicated that he would, in their report, make a more definitive comment on their fee, but it basically - it's $2,500 per month for one man. This would be on a 21-day workday per month, and this is the General Services Administration fee for that service, which will be paid by the.....

MR. BERG: We're not talking about that now.

MR. SHIELDS: No, we're not talking about that now.

MR. BERG: That would be if we decided to go ahead with this, now.

MR. SHIELDS: They will come down and make the preliminary report. There is only the travel cost involved.

MR. BERG: Is that okay? All right. Thank you.

MR. (?) : Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out that we had very little involvement in the microfilming area, but we're interested. In our type of operation, we have a minimum retention of records. We don't have a.....(inaudible).....customer problem like you do.

MR. BERG: Are you saying that you're trying to get us to consider something less than $80?

.....(Inaudible).....All talking at once.

MR. BERG: That's later, the $2,500, we can argue about later. No questions? We'll move along then to Item 14, which is Mr. Costello, Employee Insurance - Workmen's Comp. Is that covered already by the previous report? Okay.

Okay. All right. Number 16 has to do with Water Reuse. Mel Sueltenfuss. Mel, do you have a report for us? Please.

MR. MEL SUELTENFUSS: A very brief report. Well, let me take garbage first, and we want to report that we have not made a deal with the Guru, contrary to what you've seen in the newspaper. Actually, the report was so erroneous, the Guru has never contacted us for the garbage, so it's still ours, as far as I'm concerned. But very briefly, I think the garbage conversion situation is a whole lot like the personnel thing. It's something that we need to go at very slowly, because there is so much.....(inaudible).....change. Everyday you pick up the paper, there's something new, there's so much legislation in the hopper now and there's all kinds of possibilities for financing down the road.

MR. BERG: Let me just add there's so much information and misinformation.....

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Misinformation - probably more misinformation than information.

MR. BERG: More misinformation.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: That's right and, so.....

Mr. (?) : Don't identify the paper.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: But basically, I think, this is one that - if we got too hasty on, we could make a real bad decision on it. Let me say this, that we're planning two transfer stations in the north side of town, which will fit into any type of program we go into. And this is the type of planning that we've got or going into that we certainly will always have, say, an abortive system, that's a good word, for the alternative of garbage for fuel. If this thing ever fails, or if it doesn't work out, all of our planning is such that we can go back to a landfill operation. And, so that we're flexible up to the last minute in all of this, until we make a final decision - that any planning, any capital expenditure that we're making now, will fit into either program. And I think that's important to remember, because, of course, some of the legislation now is the taking off the.....differentials on iron ore and scrap metal, this is one that's probably going to come about and that will, of course, make scrap metal prices just soar even more. That one looks like it will be taken off very shortly, but there's so much in the hopper right now that our planning is such that I think that we'll have to take a wait-and-see attitude, at this time, on this thing. In connection with the water reuse, we got some good news last week on that, and that is that the - under the new 208 plan that the state is going to - the Federal Government is going to fund, through the State Government, to San Antonio, we will receive considerable planning funds for sewer studies for the - to meet the 1983 standards, and I'm happy to report that probably our entire planning for this project be funded, Tom, through the Federal Government, through this study and so, I'm glad to report that, again, procrastination

on that case paid off. We're going to proceed with the aerial mapping on the line work next week. We're also going to go ahead with that much of it. It looks like we're well funded on that program.

MR. BERG: Does this include - I just want to bring my memory up to date.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Surely.

MR. BERG: The water that's going to be used - additional water required for Calaveras Lake and the pipeline to bring the water over.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Yes, actually, you see, let me go just very quickly - the 208 plan says that by 1983, you can no longer discharge any pollutants into a stream, number one. Number two, that all streams should be in a condition for fishing and swimming. Now, the 208 plan directs itself to meeting those goals of those objectives and part is, stay on the alternatives, and, of course, this is an alternative and this is how we will be able to finance this study through this. I still don't think it's a very viable alternative, and I think Public Service Board has still indicated they still need the water down the lines, so, I think it's a.....

MR. BERG: Well, I raised that question, because water will always remain a very important priority thing, as you know, Mel, in regard to utility needs, and, you know, it takes ten years to get things settled.....substantial amount of additional water.....

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Well, if this thing works out like it does, too. It's such an economical way of handling this waste water treatment aspect, but I know Public Service Board is proceeding with some studies on the water quality aspects of it, and so. But these are long-range programs, both of these, something that we're not going to say, or set up any definite deadline or goals on it, because I think we get ourselves in a box if we do.

MR. BERG: With regard to fuel, we - the garbage for fuel - we pass by that awful fast in terms of mention of misinformation, I'd just like to comment, that it's unfortunate the unbelievable amount of misinformation that is there about this subject by people who really ought to know better, but nothing is going to happen very fast, because of the huge expenditure required. We're talking of something well over $100,000,000 that would be required to make any sort of a decent power plant to use up and generate electricity in addition to whatever you would require for burning, so there's going to be a lot of discussion, there's not going to be any.....

MR. SCHAEFER: Probably the Water Board can put the fire out cheaper than that.

MR. BERG: You're right. You know there's going to be a lot of talk before anybody can come up with that kind of money for something that will have to be evaluated.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Of course, I think, this Saint Louis process is the one that lends itself more easily to adaption for coal-burning plants, and that one looks closer to being something that we might be able to utilize. But, I think that we'll see a lot more experience next year on this thing and I think the other big variable is the undeterminable amounts of the salvage material. This has been greatly oversold. Everybody got in the paper collecting business here, and it was a big thing, and we were, frankly, being criticized

here locally for not going into it. Well, I understand that those cities that are in - now have tons and tons of paper just sitting around. No customer need for them. And so, these are things that the - that you just don't jump into and I think that this whole thing has got to be studied very carefully. I think this thing that we've got going for us is that we definitely have to move out of the north end of town, because the inability to obtain landfills, and fortunately the plant is south and so our landfills are south. The logistics - we're not going to hurt our logistics any by moving in that direction.

MR. BERG: No, I don't think so. I just want to caution - before you people run into building a power plant with the extensive amount of money required, there's going to have to be a lot more information to justify that kind of a thing.

MR. DEELY: I'd just like to add that the amount of power that's available in the sewers is very, very small.

MR. BERG: Very small.

MR. DEELY: Very small in terms of.....

MR. SUELTENFUSS: The four or five percent of it, we agree, that it's in that range.

MR. BERG: Well, to get even four or five for some of our total capacity that we now have, would cost you more than $100,000,000. It would cost you about $250,000,000 to build a - well, it would cost $250,000,000 was the last figure I saw to build a 400,000 kilowatt plant. And I can think of many other less expensive ways to build a 400,000 kilowatt plant by using garbage.....

MR. SUELTENFUSS: You've got different numbers than I've got, Mr. Berg.

MR. BERG: Well, that's the problem with this thing. For example, Saint Louis still doesn't tell you about all of the pollution of the chlorine coming out of the smokestack.....

MR. SUELTENFUSS: We have a real good report. There's no problem at all on that. I mean they're pretty well and I'll send you a copy of that. It's very interesting, it's done by a group of people, and I don't think.....

MR. BERG: There are many conflicting reports.

MR. SUELTENFUSS: Well, this is the problem on this thing, but I think, basically, on converting coal plants and, of course, what's the local utility there, I'm drawing a blank. Saint Louis Union Electric is, of course, is building a 2,000 ton plant, and it's going to be interesting to see what the final outcome on that is going to be. They're proceeding full speed ahead on that one, I think. But, anyhow, I think we all agree..... I think we're all in agreement, that if this is something that doesn't happen tomorrow, that we're - we're moving on it, but we're moving with caution.

MR. SCHAEFER: Mr. Chairman, knowing Mel's sense of humor, could we compliment him on a swell report.

MR. BERG: Thank you. Any questions? Can I have a motion for adjournment?

MR. MADISON: The next meeting then will be the meeting March 14.

MR. BERG: That's a good question. That means we'll eliminate the February meeting, right? I don't see a need for a February meeting, do you?

MR. MADISON: That will be a meeting just for the consultants' report?

MR. BERG: That's right. All right, let's agree on that, if there's no objection. The next meeting will be March 14 on the Mayor's Committee. All right. Thank you very much.

* * * *