

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1979.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: CISNEROS, WEBB, DUTMER, WING, EURESTE, THOMPSON, ALDERETE, CANAVAN, ARCHER, STEEN, COCKRELL; Absent: NONE.

79-36 The invocation was given by The Reverend James Puckett, Harlandale Southern Baptist Church.

79-36 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

79-36 CORRECTION TO THE MINUTES

Mrs. Dutmer commended the City Clerk's Office for doing a fine job on a heavy set of minutes, however, she made reference to a typographical error on page 32, first paragraph, fifth line, the word, "partake" should read "participate." With this correction, the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 1979, were approved.

79-36 CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, explained that there was a tie bid in Item 4, Section I, regarding Item 11 between Pritchard Services Inc., and Main Building Maintenance. He further explained that there would be a casting of lots whereby the lowest number drawn would be awarded the contract.

Mayor Cockrell drew the number 15 for Pritchard Services Inc., and the number 12 for Main Building Maintenance. Main Building Maintenance was declared the winner.

Mr. Steen moved that the items constituting the Consent Agenda be approved, with the exception of items 22, 27, 28, and 29, to be considered individually. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinances, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 51,008

ACCEPTING THE BID OF VULCAN SIGNS AND STAMPINGS, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT WITH ALUMINUM SIGN BLANKS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,390.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,009

ACCEPTING THE BID OF EXECUTIVE DEVICES TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH A PORTABLE COMMUNICATIONS CENTER FOR A TOTAL OF \$4,995.00, LESS 1% - 10 DAYS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,010

ACCEPTING THE QUALIFIED BID OF GOLDTHWAITE'S OF TEXAS, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT WITH A MECHANICAL SAND TRAP RAKE FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$3,352.80.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,011

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF CAMPBELL-INCE DISTRIBUTING, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FIRE DEPARTMENT WITH HEATERS, NATURAL GAS, ELECTRIC AND VENT FITTINGS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$17,520.15.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,012

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF DAVIS TRUCK & EQUIPMENT, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AUTOMOTIVE OPERATIONS DIVISION WITH A REFUSE COLLECTION UNIT FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$10,000.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,013

ACCEPTING THE QUALIFIED BID OF BLAUER MANUFACTURING CO., INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH BODY ARMOR FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$3,888.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,014

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF MOTOROLA, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AVIATION DEPARTMENT AND THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WITH RADIO COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$12,740.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,015

ACCEPTING THE QUALIFIED BIDS OF VARIOUS COMPANIES TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH VARIOUS SUPPLIES AND SERVICES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1979-1980.

\* \* \* \*

SECTION I

The attached qualified bid of each of the bidders listed below, wherein said bidder offers to furnish the City of San Antonio with the certain parts and services specified in its bid proposal for a one year period commencing August 1, 1979 and terminating on July 31, 1980, is hereby accepted.

COMMODITY

VENDOR

- |  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <p>1. Air Conditioning - Materials and Labor to Maintain Air Conditioning Systems at City Hall, City Hall Annex, the Police Department, Municipal Court Building, Public Welfare Building and Market Square Area</p> | <p>Gillette Air Conditioning Co.</p> |
|--|--------------------------------------|

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Compressors - Ingersoll Parts and Service | Royal Matthiessen Equipment and Supply Company |
| 3. Food - Dog and Cat                        | Leon Springs Feed and Supply                   |
| 4. Janitorial Service                        |  |
| Item 1 - Health Education Bldg.              | San Antonio Contract Maintenance               |
| Item 2 - (Menchaca Homes Clinic);            |  |
| Item 4 (City Hall Annex)                     | Main Building Maintenance                      |
| Item 3 (Mirasol Dental Clinic)               | Main Building Maintenance                      |

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,016

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF HOCKNEY COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WITH AN UNDERWATER WEED CUTTER FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$5,225.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,017

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF WARREX COMPUTER CORPORATION OF SAN ANTONIO TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AVIATION DEPARTMENT WITH A LINE PRINTER FOR MINI COMPUTER FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$10,810.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,018

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$306,224.95 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE AND/OR EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF TITLE AND/OR EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,019

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND TO PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN DESIGNATED CITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT- YEAR 5 PROGRAM.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,020

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS TO VARIOUS ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS FOR SERVICES ON PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROJECTS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,021

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF M.B. KILLIAN COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$346,470.95 TO CONSTRUCT RAMSEY-ISOM ROAD PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT COVERING SAID CONSTRUCTION; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT AS HEREIN INDICATED.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,022

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$18,143.00 TO THE CONTRACT FOR REPLACEMENT OF TWO EXISTING RAW SLUDGE PUMPS IN THE WEST PLANT PRIMARY SLUDGE PUMP HOUSE AND TWO PUMPS IN THE EAST PLANT PRIMARY SLUDGE HOUSE OF RILLING ROAD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,023

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS WITH SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION FOR THE SAN PEDRO CREEK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AND THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT,

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,024

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF JOE F. MORALES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., IN THE SUM OF \$141,763.00 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MCALLISTER PARK SOCCER CENTER; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACT THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENTS OF THE CONTRACT AMOUNT AND OF \$9,555.00 FOR CONTINGENT CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,025

AUTHORIZING THE CLOSING OF SAN SABA STREET BETWEEN DOLOROSA AND WEST COMMERCE STREETS ON AUGUST 4, 1979, DURING CERTAIN HOURS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,026

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$14,812 TO THE TEXAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE FOR SERVICES TO BE RENDERED DURING THE 1979-1980 FISCAL YEAR,

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,027

ACCEPTING THE HIGH BIDS FROM CERTAIN BANKS RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH CITY FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEPOSIT IN INTEREST-BEARING CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,028

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF REFUNDS TO PERSONS MAKING OVERPAYMENTS OR DOUBLE PAYMENTS ON CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TAXES.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,029

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS - 1979 PROJECT THROUGH AUGUST 10, 1979; ACCEPTING ADDITIONAL FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,316.86 FOR THE PROGRAM FROM THE ALAMO AREA OF GOVERNMENTS AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH AACOG FOR THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS; AND APPROPRIATING ADDITIONAL FUNDS IN THE PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Dutmer, seconded by Mr. Archer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Steen.

AN ORDINANCE 51,030

GRANTING A LICENSE TO BEXAR COUNTY NATIONAL BANK TO MAINTAIN A PNEUMATIC TUBE UNDER 100 BLOCK OF TRAVIS STREET FOR A FIVE YEAR PERIOD.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,031

AMENDING THE FOOD AND BEVERAGE CONCESSION CONTRACT WITH HANDY ANDY, INC., AT MUNICIPAL SWIMMING POOLS BY AUTHORIZING THE CONTRACTOR TO CLOSE CONCESSION OPERATIONS AT WOODLAWN AND CONCEPTION POOLS.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance, Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, explained the reasons for the closing of the concession operations at Concepcion and Woodlawn swimming pools.

In response to Mr. Alderete, Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated that at the present time, their department is looking into the possibility of having a non-profit organization operate these concession stands, next summer.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb.

79-36 Item 28.

The City Council approved Mayor Pro-Tem Joe Webb's request for travel to attend the meeting of the Finance, Administration & Intergovernmental Relations Steering Committee (National League of Cities), to be held in Vail, Colorado, August 23-25, 1979.

79-36 Item 29.

The City Council approved Mayor Lila Cockrell's request for travel to attend the National League of Cities Board of Directors meeting, to be held in Savannah, Georgia, August 3-5, 1979.

79-36 ZONING HEARINGS

30. Case 7698 - to rezone Lot 7-B, NCB 11971, 942 Isom Road from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the southeast side of Isom Road, being 350' southwest of the intersection of Jones Maltsberger Road and Isom Road, having 250' on Isom and a maximum depth of 295'.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb.

AN ORDINANCE 51,033

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 7-B, NCB 11971, 942 ISOM ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

31. CASE 7720 - to rezone the south irregular 72.57' of Lot 10, Block 2, NCB 6304, in the 100 Block of Hammond Street, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, located on the north side of Hammond Avenue approximately 51.4' west of the intersection of Hammond Avenue and Olive Street, having 51.5' on Hammond Avenue and a depth of 72.57'.

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

In response to Mrs. Dutmer, Mr. Camargo stated that staff had recommended denial because they felt that the granting of this request adjacent to and across from single family dwellings is not proper.

Mr. Archer spoke against the zoning change because he felt that a billboard sign would detract from the neighborhood.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Alderete, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Thompson, Canavan, Archer; ABSENT: Webb.

AN ORDINANCE 51,032

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 SOUTH IRREGULAR 72.57' OF LOT 10, BLOCK 2, NCB 6304, IN THE 100 BLOCK OF HAMMOND STREET FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 Item 32 being a proposed ordinance authorizing execution of a professional services contract with R.L. Polk & Company to conduct an income and housing study for the City of San Antonio, in connection with the Community Development Block Grant Program was withdrawn from the agenda.

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,033

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$24,287.75 TO THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER AS PAYMENT FOR AN EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES PARAMEDIC TRAINING COURSE CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Canavan seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer expressed concern that the monies for this project had already been spent before coming to the City Council for its approval.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb.

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,035

EXTENDING THE CURRENT CONTRACT WITH ED YARDANG & ASSOCIATES TO SERVE AS THE ADVERTISING AGENCY FOR THE CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO-YEAR PERIOD.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. John Mosty, Assistant Director of the Convention and Visitors Bureau explained the procedure by which the City notifies the different advertising agencies on the submittal of their bids.

Mr. Archer stated that in the advertising field, firms are compensated for their presentation.

Dr. Cisneros commended Ed Yardang & Associates on the fine job of advertising that they have done in the past for the City of San Antonio.

Mr. Steen concurred with Dr. Cisneros' remarks.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb.

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mrs. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb.

AN ORDINANCE 51,036

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF THE CITY'S HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACT WITH REPUBLIC NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY AND PROVIDING FOR A FIFTEEN PERCENT INCREASE IN THE PREMIUM FOR HEALTH INSURANCE.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,037

BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF FOUR HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$450,000.) CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, COMBINATION TAX AND REVENUE CERTIFICATES OF OBLIGATION, SERIES 1979, DATED AUGUST 1, 1979, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT OF AN OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITY AND TO PAY CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCURRED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; PRESCRIBING THE FORM OF SUCH CERTIFICATES; FIXING AND ESTABLISHING THE INTEREST RATE FOR SAID CERTIFICATES; LEVYING A CONTINUOUS AD VALOREM TAX UPON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY IN SAID CITY AND FIXING A LIEN ON AND MAKING A PLEDGE OF THE NET REVENUES TO BE DERIVED FROM THE OPERATION OF SAID PROPOSED OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITY TO PAY THE INTEREST ON SAID CERTIFICATES AND TO CREATE A SINKING FUND FOR THE REDEMPTION THEREOF; AND PROVIDING FOR THE ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF SAID TAXES AND THE HANDLING OF SAID REVENUES; ENACTING OTHER PROVISIONS INCIDENT AND RELATING TO THE SUBJECT AND PURPOSE OF THIS ORDINANCE; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the Ordinance. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

Mr. Archer stated that he would be voting "No" on this Ordinance because he felt that the cost was too high for the building of this parking garage. He made reference to the engineering and architectural fees.

City Manager, Tom Huebner, explained the need for the certificates of obligation. He also explained that the project is vital to the desired revitalization of downtown San Antonio.

Mayor Cockrell explained the process which the City follows in hiring architects for City jobs.

Dr. Cisneros stated that he disagreed with Mr. Archer's comments and spoke in support of the Ordinance.

In response to Mr. Steen's question, Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, informed the Council that a "B" Session would be scheduled in a couple of weeks for the purpose of discussing architectural and engineering fees and the procedure by which the City awards these type of contracts.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Archer; ABSENT: None.

79-36 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 51,038

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF THE UNEXPENDED BALANCES IN THE 1970 GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND LIBRARY IMPROVEMENTS, FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES AND NORTHWEST SERVICE CENTER FUNDS TO THE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS DEBT SERVICE FUND FOR PAYMENT OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 1970 GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS ISSUE.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,039

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$336,695.00 IN THE DEVELOPER CUSTOMER SEWER CONNECTIONS ACCOUNT FOR EXPENDITURES IN 1978/79 FOR DEVELOPER CUSTOMER SEWER LINE CONNECTIONS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,040

AUTHORIZING CHARGES TO VARIOUS FUNDS TO REIMBURSE THE GENERAL FUND FOR COST OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE RIGHT-OF-WAY & LAND ACQUISITION DIVISION AND THE ENGINEERING AND TESTING AND INSPECTIONS DIVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT IN CONNECTION WITH VARIOUS PROJECTS DURING THE 1978/79 FISCAL YEAR.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,041

AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE TO WRITE OFF CERTAIN DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE OF THE AVIATION AND CONVENTION FACILITIES DEPARTMENTS DEEMED UNCOLLECTIBLE.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

In response to Mrs. Dutmer's question, Mr. Carl White, Director of the Finance Department, explained the reason why the City has not been able to collect on these accounts.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 51,042

APPROPRIATING ADDITIONAL FUNDS AND RE-PROGRAMMING PRIOR APPROPRIATIONS IN CERTAIN FUNDS TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED REQUIREMENTS IN CITY DEPARTMENTS AND GRANT PROJECTS.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,043

RESERVING UNEXPENDED 1978-79 APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR CARRY FORWARD AS 1979-80 APPROPRIATIONS; AUTHORIZING THE LAPSE OF UNEXPENDED 1978-79 APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN OTHER SPECIAL PROJECTS; AND RESERVING ENCUMBRANCES OF 1978-79 APPROPRIATIONS FOR CARRY FORWARD AS 1979-80 APPROPRIATIONS.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

Mr. Alderete stated that he had asked the City Manager's staff to report on the ownership of alleys and its ad valorem tax value.

A discussion then took place between the Council and Mr. Carl White, Finance Director, on the ownership of alleys in the City.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

DISCUSSION ON ADOPTION OF THE  
1979-80 BUDGET

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,044

ADOPTING THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979-80, APPROPRIATING FUNDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SAID BUDGET, FIXING THE AUTHORIZED NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN EACH MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE, APPROVING A PAY PLAN, AND PROVIDING FOR SALARY INCREASES FOR CITY EMPLOYEES.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

The following citizens then spoke to the Council:

Ms. Jonna Lee Masters, San Antonio Cable Advisory Committee, spoke about needed funding for planned distribution of brochures which UA Columbia had printed for them.

Ms. Masters then submitted a budget of \$3,500 which they requested be funded by the City Council.

Mayor Cockrell explained to Ms. Masters that the Council had had several work sessions on the budget and felt that the request at this time was untimely.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Adelina Ortiz, Chairperson for Revenue Sharing, COPS, stated that the community needs drainage, parks, libraries, and streets. She then mentioned the priorities which they feel are imperative for the citizens of San Antonio. She also stated that revenue sharing funds should be used for drainage improvement<sup>s</sup>, not to balance the City's general budget.

Mrs. Carmen Badillo, President of COPS, also stated that revenue sharing funds should be used for capital improvements. They asked that the City Council work together for a capital improvements program. They asked that the Council support a bond election for 1980, and that they approve a resolution supporting a bond election.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Juan Patlan, Mexican American Unity Council, made an appeal to the Council to reconsider the decision made concerning MAUC's Family Development Program. He stated that if they do not receive funds from the City, they will lose matching federal monies amounting to \$1 million.

In response to Mr. Archer, Mr. Patlan stated that they must adhere very strictly to federal guidelines which do not permit the transfer of monies from one project to another.

A discussion then took place on MAUC's participation in the UDAG venture. It was again emphasized that grant funds received for a housing program cannot be used for a development program.

\* \* \* \*

The following discussion by the Council then took place:

MR. JOE ALDERETE: Madam Mayor, the action that was taken last night by the Council that was to parcel out the money at a \$130,000.00 a piece and let them spend it in the manner they sought fit, I think that, in retrospect now, it seems to be a very irregular and maybe somewhat of an improper manner to handle such matters that are of City-wide magnitude.

My concern stems from the fact that some agencies receive partial funding, other agencies receive equitable funding or funding they needed, and some agencies even went over the amount that they requested. The problem occurs, though, is that when some Council persons took on the obligation of thinking in a City-wide manner, they bothered to fund those agencies that affect the entire City as a whole. Other Council members took the position that I'm going to try to save the monies for my particular district. I, for one, was a Council member that took the \$130,000.00 and expended to what I thought was a San Antonio or a City-wide service. After giving it a lot of thought and reflection, I really would like to have the Council reconsider their position of last night and give more thought to a City-wide beneficial program, and I know that philosophically there may be some problems and some differences; but I think that there is a concern on my part that a lot of social service programs that I think are direly needed in our community are not properly being backed, either financially or morally by the City of San Antonio. I, for one, receive some social services but by far, most of the social services do not lie in my area, but I still supported City-wide efforts as other Council members did here, yourself, Councilman Steen and other members.

I've got a proposal here in front of all the Council members, a list of the agencies that I think could use the proper amount of funding. The list has on the first column under the date, July 25, 1979, the amounts of monies that were allocated to them as of last night, I thought it would be fair and proper upon the recommendation of a fellow colleague of mine, Councilman Steen, that anybody that received an amount of money not be undercut from that amount, and that was a very fair approach, and fair recommendation on his part. So, we did not touch anybody that was funded last night at all, of those social services or arts programs and let them become a part of the total social service program budget.

What I'm recommending, Madam Mayor, is of the monies that the Manager found, \$1,424,800.00, that \$1,239,900 go to social services programs, that the balance of \$184,900.00 go to a City-wide school sidewalk program plus that City-wide program affects every single district in the City. It is a need that is expressed by organizations that are neighborhood organizations, school organizations, PTA's, you name it, everybody wants school sidewalks in their district. It's City-wide in nature; it's City-wide in value. I think that in addition to this, there's possibly I think, Public Works might have set aside some monies in the budget for school sidewalk programs. I think that this is the most fair approach that we can possibly have in handling those monies instead of a pork barrel style manner. And I think that the Council would be wise in revising its decision of last night and funding these agencies in this manner that helps out the entire City and not just a particular district, and I would like to move that these agencies that are on this list which the Manager and all the Council members should have a list of, and the other remaining \$184,900.00 be set aside for a City-wide school sidewalk program.

DR. HENRY CISNEROS: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, there has been an amendment offered to the budget, that is, the budget as printed, or as formulated for the Council, has included in it, the list that had been agreed to out of the discussion last night. Mr. Alderete's amendment would substitute the list which he has distributed for the proposals that were agreed to last night, or in changing certain categories. Now, then the next person is Mr. Wing.

July 26, 1979

1

MR. FRANK WING: Yes, Madam, I would like to remind Mr. Alderete that he was the one that voted for the pork-barrel system that you devised last night, and I spoke out against it last night, and I'm speaking out against it today. I would ask the Council to reconsider the proposal that was put to you last night, that deals with 19 out of those social services agencies that appear on Mr. Alderete's list and in addition to that, directs almost \$600,000.00 for capital improvements. That was the plan that the majority of this Council voted down last night. I can't make the motion. I was on the losing side. So after this motion goes through, I would hope that someone from the prevailing side would at least see fit, if they do think that they pork barrelled it last night to at least reconsider the motion from last night.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Point of information.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Point of information.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, I would like to provide information. I'm not asking for some, I think the information that I would provide is that...

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: That's speaking to the motion. Point of order.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, a point of order has been called.

MRS. DUTMER: That's speaking to the motion, Madam Mayor, he is not allowed to give information, he is allowed to seek information under the privilege of point of information.

MR. EURESTE: Well, let me give my information in the form of a question.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Eureste, would you state your ...

MR. EURESTE: Is it not right that the motion to reconsider is the appropriate motion that would have been taken up yesterday, at the same meeting and that today, that would no longer hold and that what the Council member might do himself is to offer the motion to rescind. And anyone can do that, or an amendment.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, to clarify the parliamentary situation, I think you were referring to Mr. Wing's comment. Let me clarify that it would not, as of today, require a motion to reconsider.

MR. WING: I can bring up the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, you can. In other words, the action that is taken at a "B" Session is action that refers something to the "A" Session, or it is action that is not complete until final action and adoption in the "A" Session. We have before us the main budget as agreed to last night. What we have pending is an amendment and so this amendment must now be disposed of in one way or another and once it is adopted, should it be adopted, it would then become part of the main motion. If it is rejected, then an alternate could be considered.

MRS. DUTMER: Point of information. I will take advantage of your tactics, Mr. Eureste, and I will put it in the form of a question. Is it not true that a motion to reconsider must come at the same meeting wherein it was decided.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, that is correct. That is why a motion to reconsider is not necessary today. The action does not preclude persons from the "A" Session, however, of introducing motions at the "A" Session of changing or substituting the action. All right the next speaker is Mr. Canavan.

MR. GENE CANAVAN: I'd just like to comment that I've seen two or three lists of projects, indirectly none of which I have really gotten an opportunity to address, I think partially because my feelings are very obvious. I think the responsibility of this City Council is to provide for the capital improvements City-wide. I see a package here, that quite honestly would rob what little funds that the northside, my particular district has. There are such simple things as street lights, that we don't have because we don't have proper funding; we're not eligible for Community Development Block Grant Funds. I just think that this thing can continue to grow and grow.

I think that - I voted for it last night when I would have preferred to see all funds go to capital improvements on a City-wide basis. I voted for the pork barrelling, because if I had not done that, and the motion didn't pass, something like this would happen where the funds were just allocated by a few members that got together. I have no real problem with it other than, I certainly would hate to see what few projects that I can get done in my district, and what I think the Council is supposed to do, wind up going to additional programs. I work very hard, as an individual, to help fund as many of these social agencies as I can probably as much as most if not more, and I think that really is where we have to expend our efforts in the private sector to help these very worthy groups out, and I agree with a lot of the people here; but I think there are some very definite capital needs in this community, and I'd like to see them addressed and the closest thing I think we can come to is what we agreed upon last night.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I would like to stick to the agreement that we made last evening also, and I will quote from last week's minutes, when a certain project came up that was a favorite of a certain Council person. It was surprising to a lot of people that we would take such a bold step as this represents, what the Council did, and the Council promises to take other bold steps but not if it starts a pattern of hesistancy after having once indicated a course of action in the "B" Session." And that person will know who they are.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes Mayor, the first point I would like to make is that Mr. Alderete's list is a very balanced City-wide list, and it is truly not fair to put the burden for this City having, for example, a ballet program, on just a few of the Council members. Now, on the list, for example, is the San Antonio Free Clinic which serves primarily north San Antonio. The San Antonio Ballet which is an asset to the whole community as much an asset in its time as the symphony is now. The Institute of the Americas, which is designed to be an international program to develop San Antonio's role vis-a-vis Central and South America, Drug Abuse Central, which operates in the school, which has been lauded by the Police Department. Big Brothers and Sisters which costs less to fund for a year by the City than it costs to send one child to a juvenile detention facility. It costs \$14,000.00 to keep a child in a juvenile detention facility; they're asking for \$12,000.00. The Bexar County Women's Center being recommended here for half of what it requires but, again, with a City-wide impact, as a matter of fact, up to now, primarily, oriented toward north San Antonio. The Autistic Treatment Center is on here for \$34,000.00 which will again make it possible to finance a City-wide activity. Now, I know it's not ideal to fund these agencies. They ought to be able to fund themselves, but the facts are that these are important activities and so my first point, is that they're City-wide, and it's not fair to have just a couple of Council members step forward and do it.

Now, the second thing I'd like to say is about capital improvements. Capital improvements in this town are needed. I completely agree with what Mrs. Badillo said earlier about the need for a bond election, and personally, we'll support it, sooner or later, this fall or next winter, whenever we're finally going to get around to it. But, I do believe strongly that we need to have a bond election, and we need to get capital projects on there. It is not possible to do capital projects, expensive as they are with the one to one point five million dollars that we're talking about with this amount of money. It's just not possible. We will deal with 50 or 75, or whatever it is going to be, a million dollar bond issue, and that's where we will get our impact on capital improvements.

The third point I'd like to make is that I think that we set a very dangerous precedent last night. I thought about it and personally feel that I made a mistake which I will admit to in voting for the \$130,000.00 per district.

And I'll tell you why I think it's a mistake. Last term, we introduced the districting system and every Councilman came representing a district, but every money decision had to be made by the Council as a whole. Every money decision had to be made by the Council sitting as a group. For the first time last night, we've introduced a new dimension to the districting system, and that is that Council members will have discretion over how much money goes to an agency alone. Council member one on one; or Council members will have discretion over what projects in their district that they can fund out of a personal kitty of \$130,000.00 that is put together. Now, that is a giant step toward what people said they were afraid would happen when districting came, which was a ward kind of commissioner form of government, which is that individuals have a budget for the first time, that is the case as a result of last night's decision; and some Councilmen are going to go to an agency and say, "I funded the agency, because if I hadn't spent it out of my budget, out of my \$130,000 the agency wouldn't be funded." And those are going to go and they're going to say, "This community wants a street light", and the Traffic Director says, "Well, we don't have enough money for a street light," and the Councilman can say, "But you do have the money, because I have \$130,000 in the fund that I have set aside that's been allocated to me and I'm keeping it." And I just really question whether we want to take that step because it is a giant step towards something that has not existed before since 1952 and a giant step towards something that we didn't have in the districting system, until the decision of last night, and I really, really caution against it now.

The school program that Joe has suggested is a needed program. As a matter of fact, if someone says that the northside is being short-changed, that is not true. Because the schools that need - the areas that need school sidewalks, more than any others are those where there are more new schools, and there are more new schools in the newer areas of the community. And that's where the bulk of that money is going to be spent. It's a good project, City-wide project, that Joe Alderete has suggested here; and I would strongly suggest to the whole Council, in the interest of thinking about a bond issue, in the interest of looking at fair and balanced expenditures, in the interest of everybody carrying their fair share of important social agencies that we deal with this list, as a way to do it, and granted that we have to retract our action of last night. I, for one, am saying, "I made a mistake and I'm prepared to vote this list, today."

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes Madam. There was, you know, there was a speech that was made a little while ago about a bond issue, and I would hope that we could give some kind of direction today, at least for a meeting of the Council in a "B" Session where this item could be brought up.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's already on the schedule.

MR. EURESTE: When is that for?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Actually, it was scheduled for early September. I might just add September 1st, that I would be happy, personally, to see it even moved up a couple of weeks, if it turns out to be possible.

MR. EURESTE: I would hope that we could move it up. The other one, I'm not happy with what's happened. There are a number of people that are going to be put out in the streets on August 1, which is next week, because some of these agencies have not been funded. And I'm as concerned of that happening with the agencies, as I have been with City employees when we have considered rolling back the budget, and in the sort of strategies that I have worked on over the past year and a half, at least, my roll-back proposals have always attempted to bring about a reduction in budgetary spending, by rolling back on the budget through attritioning personnel, leaving vacant positions frozen, and forced upon the City a slowing down in the growth of the bureaucracy.

Why? Well, because people are asking for a slow down in the growth of the bureaucracy. Nothing scientific about that concern, it's just that's where people happen to be at today. Somewhere down the road in a few years from now, maybe, we'll go into another cycle where people are asking an increase in service and then they'll be asking for an increase in the bureaucracy. There's nothing scientific about that, but it will happen to be where people are at. So, in order to achieve that goal, then I have asked that we have rollbacks, but that employees not be fired or displaced because of that. Likewise, when it comes to the agencies, there are agencies that have employees on board.

In a number of these programs here there are agencies that have employees on board, those employees will be walking the street or be looking for a job or be not employed perhaps, come sometime next week.

I'm not comfortable with the decision that was made last night, although I agreed with it, I'm not comfortable right now. I think what Councilman Cisneros has said is very true, that it's a very bad habit to get into; it's a very bad precedent to set where we divide, where we divide the surplus. A news reporter came up to me immediately after we made that decision and immediately after the Council adjourned, and said you know, "Ben, why don't you take the 181 million dollars and divide it eleven ways," and that sounded you know, very much like what we had done with the surplus money; it's perhaps, one of the most dangerous ways for a Council to conduct City business. And I don't think I'm gonna - I cannot fault the person who initiated the idea, I would simply say to the full Council that voted on it, and really the full Council because we are all responsible for the actions of this body, that that decision could get us into difficulty later on down the line. It is establishing a precedent in which a Council member will have a kitty. Today, it is 130 thousand dollars for each Council person and I'm going to try to be responsible and place that money in organizations that are ongoing already and that might have to lose employees because of that. But at the same time, were that not the situation and I had to be making decisions on another way of distributing that money as in the case of capital improvements and I had a 130 thousand dollars in an account that was set aside for District 5. I think that would be giving me more power than was intended in the Charter of the City, in the City Charter that we have. That would possibly be giving more power than was anticipated under the Council-Manager form of government, and it is falling directly in line with the cautions that had been addressed by those people who were very concerned about districts and the bringing about of districts for the City of San Antonio, that very possibly we could establish ward bosses and wardism in this community. It is very dangerous. I got a call this morning from a lady, from one of the agencies and she asked me, "I understand you got 130 thousand dollars," and I said "yes," she said, "Can you give me five thousand, or ten thousand, Mr. Eureste?" I don't think we should put people in that position where they are looking just to you, to one person, as having been the person who funded the agency.

Last night, we - there are a number of people that can be identified with any number of agencies that are covered already. If the Advocates are funded at 20 thousand, that 20 thousand came from one Council member. If the Autistic Treatment Center gets funded at 34, that 34 thousand can be traced back to one Council member. It was recorded, the "B" Session was recorded last night, unless there's something wrong with the tape recorder. And so on, down the road, and I think that is a little dangerous, I mean we all like to be treated and accorded, you know, all of the red carpet treatment that we get by many of the programs that we fund. But all of us are given basically equal recognition and equal credit for bringing about that decision. It is very possible that we are setting ourselves up if we continue in the manner that we have up to last night, that we could be regarded as the patron, the patron saint of an agency, simply because we had 130 thousand dollars to play around with or to award and individually, we made a decision to give ten thousand to this agency, 20 to this one, 30 to that one, or maybe a whole whack of 100 thousand dollars to a given agency, and I would just hope that we just reverse ourselves and put the City Council gears in reverse and get ourselves out of that very dangerous situation because today's 130 for each Council member, next year it could be 25 thousand for each Council member, the year after, it could be a million dollars for each Council member, of course, which would be kind of neat, but it also could

be kind of dangerous. What would keep a Council member from being crazy enough to go out there and build himself with a million dollars a district office and what would be wrong with him using that money hire his own animal control team, and administrative aides that are under contract to him and to run his district, I think there's a lot of danger.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Steen.

MR. JOHN STEEN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I hope that none of the agencies that are perhaps individually funded by the individual Council members think anyone of us is a saint, because I can tell we're not. I don't know a saint on the City Council so let's erase that from our minds, I'm afraid we might believe Bennie on that particular point; we know that's not true. You know, we're going to talk a pretty long time about this, and I'm going to sort of try to be a little bit brief and just say what I think about it. In the first place, let me say that we do have \$9,800,000 in revenue sharing funds that we have to include in the budget for this coming year and everyone of us realizes that these funds should be used for capital improvements, there's no question about that in any of our minds, but the trade out that we'd have to make if we did that would be, perhaps, to increase the property taxes, in the amount of 36 cents. We'd have to go up from \$1.65 to \$2.04 per hundred, and I don't believe that many of our citizens would be interested in having a property rate increase of 39 cents at this time. So, it is a necessity that we include that close to 10 million dollars in the regular budget. I want everyone to realize and I know they do, an increase is probably coming up in your City Water Board rates, this year or next year. If we continue to promote the Applewhite Reservoir more increases will be coming up in your water bill. You have to look at VIA, your transit system, they want more money; they want to increase their fares. You have to look at Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, they want more money. We've already granted the CPS people an additional amount of money to charge the citizens. It just goes on and on, and I think Mr. Archer has gone into this in an eloquent way, some several weeks ago. But on top of all that I certainly wouldn't want to force a property rate increase on the citizens in order to use the revenue sharing funds for capital improvements.

Last night at the meeting, I thought that Councilman Frank Wing had the best proposition. I listened - I talked to Frank during the day, he had talked to me and we had gone over his list together. I thought it was a good list, I even thought that, perhaps, it would pass through the City Council last night; it did not, I think it got two votes. I think if I remember correctly, Wing, Thompson, and I voted for his particular proposition and, therefore, it failed for a lack of a majority of votes from the City Council. After that failed, we went into the present thing where each one of us gets 130 thousand dollars, and to me, that's not the ideal situation.

I took my 130 thousand dollars last night and divided it among five different agencies. One of which was the San Antonio Ballet group; the other four were outside agencies having to do with people and I do put the quality of lives of people in my district above capital improvements in my district. I have to tell you that; and I doubt if there are many people from my district out in the audience today, but I'll always fight to improve the lives of people before I will fight to have capital improvements in District 10 because I think that's what this country is all about. If we cannot take care of the people that we should take care of, then we shouldn't be living in this country because this country is a great country, and that's part of the duty of each citizen to take care of those people that cannot take care of themselves. And there's a long list of those people and I'm more than glad to do that.

I will say this one thing that two of my agencies that I'm funding with my money for this coming year will not be funded for the following year because they'll be independent and on their own. So, I'll only have two agencies left over. I want to tell these agencies today, and the people that are here if they do have representatives present in the audience, that they don't owe me nothing. I don't want any thing from any of these people because I'm doing what I think is best for the people and not what is best for me or for my district. I just think that these agencies are needed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Excuse me, just a moment. We would appreciate it if the audience would be quiet.

MRS. CARMEN BADILLO: Well, we're having a little problem. I'm trying to see that they'll just be patient enough for what the Council people have to say. It looks like it's just going and going and going.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, thank you, fine, yes. This is the Council's opportunity to debate a \$200 million budget and it's very, very important to have everybody debating. Go ahead, Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: I will apologize to the audience, I thought I was going to be brief, and then I got carried away, I think I - a little of Bennie is rubbing off on me. But, I will try to conclude my remarks at this time by saying that I'm not going to change my vote from last night, I thought about it alot; I talked to Joe about his deal, but I think what we did last night might be right, it might be wrong, but we've got to stick by it. We're evenly divided up here on the Council right now, half of us want to stick with last night's decision, half of us want to go with the new schedule that's the way it looks to me, and if that's the way it is, I'm going to stick with what we've already decided and that's what we decided last night, and I'm going to vote for the motion on the floor without the amendment when the time comes. Thank you very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The motion that is on the floor is the first motion, is the amendment which is Mr. Alderete's amendment, and the main motion is the one adopting the budget with the recommendation from last night. Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, just very briefly, Madam Mayor. The list of agencies that are listed here are all agencies that have been mentioned by all the members of Council that took a particular interest in noting any agencies. The other thing, Madam Mayor, I wanted to point out is that the total budget is 198 million dollars. What is represented here in the sum total of the agencies is less than 1% of the total budget for social services which I think is a very minimal amount of money that can be given to that very important facet, that very important element of a service of welfare that this City is obligated to carry out. That concludes my remarks, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I've heard some very impassioned pleas here, and of course, I am usually blunt, but lay the cards on the table. I heard some impassioned pleas for the Women's Center last evening; those pleas went unheard. I did include DAC in, and I'm going to agree, I'm one of the people who fought districting, and I'm one of the people who warned you that you would come to this impasse, right now this situation you're in right now. I'd like to sort of review and see how we came to this situation. It started last year; it started with the bond issue, very bluntly. Last year, the make-up of this Council was a little bit different than it is this year, and some people got a little bit grabby, but the citizenry disapproved of it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mrs. Dutmer, Mrs. Dutmer, May I just ask, the Chair would appreciate it, if we did not dwell too much on actions of a past Council and so on and if we could just direct it to the item on discussion.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, the Chair can request that, and I will acquiesce to the Chair's wishes, but it seems to me that the Chair is always asking something when it gets down to the blunt truth.

MAYOR COCKRELL: But may the Chair just comment that the personnel rules of the Council indicate that we try to adhere . . . .

MRS. DUTMER: Not to address any one person, if I remember reading the rules right. I did not address any one person; I can read, too. Now, under-to do for it as you say, the entire City, there is not one person here that has a family that does not do with their paycheck first for their entire family and its good which we have done with the general budget. Then if they have any surplus left at all, it's generally divided evenly between their children, and I think that's what we have done today. These are surpluses, not necessary funds. Now, there's another precedent that took place here, and that is with the Autistic Children's program. True, the 34 thousand came from one person, but in the original request they needed more money. I also contributed to that, but the man who runs this Center set a precedent in this City by coming up and saying, "I do not need the extra money because we have found other monies." I think that's a big precedent that has been set because the majority of the programs know they're going to be cut so they ask for two to three times what they think they're going to get. I don't see where capital improvements have been neglected, sidewalks, or capital improvements, and last evening when we were discussing this, not one person mentioned school sidewalks except yours truly. I wanted to reserve some funds because my district is in dire need of some school sidewalks. So, I mentioned school sidewalks, later as a trade-off it was put in the package to see if they could get my vote and that's the very blunt truth and I'm going to stick with the vote of last evening. It was a consensus vote everyone voted, including the people who have just made the motion, and I think we should stick to it and not back track.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Canavan.

MR. GENE CANAVAN: I hate to speak twice, and I am going to be extremely brief, I want to point out one thing. We have been talking about cutting back on bureaucracy and cutting back on a City budget, that in effect is not what we're doing. We're transferring funds from City purposes, City government purposes to outside agencies. So, if we were cutting back and saving the taxpayer, I'd be all for that, and we've all been guilty of talking about my 130 thousand dollars, and I'm going to have to agree with my colleague, it's the taxpayer's 130 thousand dollars that we're entrusted with to make our best decision. I think that's what each Council member is trying to do.

The reason I'm so stuck on capital improvements, if you want to know the honest truth, is I know that we're looking at CETA funds and right in the amount of \$7 million dollars that the City is using with the very, very good possibility of having them cut back if not eliminated. Revenue sharing at 9.8 million dollars is another thing that very well may get cut back, and if you don't think we're going to be looking at a tax increase if that happens in the future, I think we're all wrong. We're talking about 17 million dollars which does represent a great portion of our total funds and I think this is an opportunity for us to suck in our belts. I know it's very, as I said these programs have tremendous amounts of merits, I think the Museum is short; the zoo is short. One after the other programs that we could all look at and say they need additional funds.

I just don't think that we're in the position as a City to continue to give money to programs that are not specific or that we may not have in the future and continue year after year to build on that even though it's a small portion of our overall budget. If we get these funds cut back next year, we're going to have serious problems; so we might as well start addressing them today.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Point of information?

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I'd like to have an understanding now. If in the event some of the capital improvements that the people are looking for in their district do not come to that amount, can we revise and give, perhaps, these funds somewhere else? Or do we have to, are we nailed to using them for that specific purpose?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Anything that is listed in the budget can possibly be substituted by an amendment ordinance in the future, but the intent is that under the plan that was adopted last night, the nominations for that would come from the Council member concerned.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, I was just asking cause there's a possibility all mine won't be needed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, Mr. Archer.

MR. VAN ARCHER: I was just wanting to say that, maybe, I've said this before and repeated myself, but I don't believe it's the function of the Council to fund alot of outside agencies when we are asking the people that elected us to office to pay more and more for different types of services, and I think that everybody up here, I can truthfully say is interested in the quality of life. It's just that everybody, I guess, has got a little bit different philosophy and how you go about improving somebody's quality of life. But everybody up here is dedicated to doing that, and it just is how you, you the individual Councilman wants to go about doing your job. I guess that I don't come from that affluent a district. Alot of the people, most of the people that live out in my district are poor and many, many retired people and retired people are having a very hard time making it on a fixed income, and so what I'm going to do with this money or with your money because it certainly isn't mine is, and it's a very radical idea I will admit anytime that you want to give something back to somebody, it's radical as hell. But what I'm going to do is put this in a separate fund and it's the only way that I know of that can benefit everybody that lives in my district. But your garbage fee is going up, it's going up from \$3.00 a month to \$3.25 because the Council wants to make it self-sustaining. Now, I don't believe in that because I think that when you pay property taxes you're supposed to get something for those taxes instead of just trying to get more and more from you for everything we do, and so I want this money to go into a garbage fund, and I had to meet this morning with the attorneys and so forth, to get down to legalities. But instead of your garbage fee going from the \$3 to \$3.25, we'll work out something just for the residents in District 9, but this will go to some type of a relief to everybody to be able to get their garbage fee to go down the amount that takes up 130 thousand dollars, and in this way, I think that I will be benefiting everybody. And I wish I could do it for the whole City, but I can only do it for the people that live in District 9 and so that's where my 130 thousand dollars will go.

MAYOR COCKRELL: You're talking against the amendment, is that correct?

MR. ARCHER: I'm for the main motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Thompson.

MR. BOB THOMPSON: Thank you, Madam Mayor. There's a word that's been used, and it's been used very carelessly and it's inaccurate. This money is not surplus money at all. We have used 9.55 million dollars of money that should have been directed to capital improvements to balance our City budget and that's basically wrong. Because we have diverted that money we have a pittance left over that we're looking at to satisfy some capital projects. We are not going to be able to make a dent in the capital needs that I have in my district with 130 thousand dollars, that is tokenism. I have committed myself to funding and procuring the necessary funds for the 61 series project in my district. That's a million dollars in itself, a tremendous capital requirement. With this 9.8 million dollars tucked neatly in this budget and then out squirts some money along the sides that each Councilman now has, apparently, and we call that surplus we have - we have very deceitfully mislead ourselves; that is not surplus.

I want to say something along the line of quality of life, the quality of life in District 6 is affected by floods, by mud, by no sidewalks, by zero alleys, so the quality of life starts at people's front doors, and I as a representative of that district realize that and if we don't have capital improvements to address those needs, the quality of life is meaningless. So, I am committed, yes to improve the quality of life but it must be through capital improvement. We cannot in District 6 in the southwest sector look at some of the higher ordered cultural aspects until we can get back and forth to town, out of the mud.

Mr. Alderete, Councilman Alderete mentioned that this is less, the agency support is less than 1% of the budget. If we could divert that 1% into some of these very crying needs in my district that little 1% would do a great deal of good. Mrs. Dutmer mentioned that we have heard very many or there have been several passionate pleas on behalf of agencies, and certainly we have heard that and family first, that's true; and we're all charged to make sure that we represent our district as part of this great family of San Antonio. Who else would look after my people, who else will make sure that District 6 receives the kind of benefits that they deserve, if I don't. So, on behalf of that part of the family of San Antonio, I make a very passionate plea. I hope passionate, as it is with me, for the capital projects that my district desperately needs.

Mr. Canavan mentioned that there's serious problems with our budget, and with the removal of CETA, yes, and we have only compounded the problem as we have delayed the decision and incorporating 9.55 million dollars into our budget we did not address straight-forward the needs of this City. We have addressed ancillary needs, and we have ignored something that will be a major, major hindrance, next year in our budget and there will be no doubt that we'll have to confront it face up. The functions of our people in social agencies as Councilman Archer has addressed, I agree with some of his very conservative philosophy. I will keep the 130 thousand dollars that has been directed toward District 6 within the confines of District 6, if it all possible. We will use those to solve as many needs, and they will be the capital improvement kind of needs to solve as many needs, and they will be the capital improvement kind of needs as meager as they might be but we're going to use them for our people with our people and upon our people, and I thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Webb.

MR. WEBB: I waited so long, that I've forgotten what I was going to say. I don't know how we got in this position that we're in at the present time. But it looks like to me in the final analysis; it looks like the last, the latest proposal that I have in my hand is the best one. I wasn't present last night after the Wing proposal and after that proposal failed, the so-called Mayor's proposal was brought forward and she indicated I think, that 130 thousand dollars go per district, and I'm not really opposed to that. The only thing I'm opposed to is some of the ways that it's to be used by some of the Council members. So, as a result, I find myself not even in a bad position. Neither one of the proposals does anything at all to District 2. The best one at latest is \$180 thousand to District 2 out of the total. So, really in effect, I don't see a whole lot of great big hassle over the pittance amount of money that we're applying to social service agencies which is \$1.4 million something of the total budget of about \$200 thousand. So, a great whole lot of a hullabaloo about \$130 thousand per district is really peanuts.

Now, some of the Council who have spoke in advance, when it does reach a certain sizeable portion then you might have your eyes on that Councilman. If the amount gets to be any astronomical figures, but I think \$130 thousand is not very much to really be concerned about. However, it can evolve into a kind of thing and I'm sure it was not designed and it hasn't been thought of in that fashion that here the Council has monies to do whatever that he wishes to do with. I don't believe that that was the idea in the back of Madam Mayor's mind or any other Council member, but that seemed to be what might take place. So, as a result, I'm going to have to vote for this package. It seems like the clear way to go that Councilman Alderete has presented at this time.

I was not here to vote for any other package, but I wanted to let you know if I had been here, I would have voted last night for the Mayor's proposal or for whoever made the motion last night for the \$130 thousand per Council district and I will use it for a couple of things that has not taken place on the eastside and I want you to know what they are. Ella Austin has the Youth Advocacy Program that the need \$132 thousand. There are no halfway houses on the eastside, none, zilch,

nil. I need \$50 thousand for a halfway house. When black people come out of prison and need to be put into the main stream they have no buffer or no kind of way to enter back into society. I feel that a halfway house is very much needed on the eastside, and Mr. Alderete's proposal will address those two problems that I have in my district. I'm awful sorry that you're alluding and pointing out the fact that this, perhaps, may be a ward system that's perhaps coming up, but if that's the case and it helps me do the things that I need to do for the peaceful people in my district. That's the way I'll be voting. Again, I repeat, the \$130 thousand per district won't hurt me that much.

July 26, 1979  
mb

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam. Well, if we're going to have wardism it should work in the proper way. What I'm going to do is I'm going to support Mr. Alderete's motion. I guess that's what we're speaking to right now, the amendment.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, sir.

MR. EURESTE: Well, after that amendment either goes up or down I have a motion to offer to the Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. I might just say, I believe everyone has had their opportunity to speak. Last night I'm the one who made the suggestion for the nomination of each Council member of project or agency funding up to the amount of \$130,000. I might say that I did that for the reason that in reviewing the position of the different Council members it was clear that some would prefer to spend the money that might be available on capital improvements; others had a great concern about social agency funding, and one of our members preferred to see the money that might be made available through other savings go in some kind of a direct rebate or cutting down of costs to the constituents. So, there were positions from different points of view that were reflected in the Council, and it was for this reason that I made the recommendation that this relatively small amount of money out of the total budget, of course, \$1,400,000 is a whole lot of money to me but compared to the \$200 million approximate of the total budget, it is a smaller amount by comparison, that this amount could be perhaps best used with each Council member having the opportunity to nominate what would be about 1/11th of the suggested funding. That was agreed to last night, and I can understand some of the areas of concern that have been raised. I think that certainly we want to look at the fact that we don't want to fall into a ward system of funding, but it does seem to me that with this small amount of money that was available that each Council member could have the opportunity of making nominations for that particular amount of money. So, I am going to continue to support that because I feel that it does offer the only plan whereby each Council member could use those funds that were made available in the way that he would like to recommend or see that they would be recommended.

I will say that on the subject of the capital improvements I think that this is an issue where, hopefully, there will be a meeting of minds among many community groups, certainly we appreciate hearing from the C.O.P.S. on the subject of the capital improvements program, the need for a bond issue, and this is something that I think all members of the Council are very interested in addressing and that considering the needs in the community, it will take a bond issue to address them.

All right, that concludes certainly my remarks. Are there any others before we have the vote on the amendment from the Council. All right, the clerk will call the roll. This is on the amendment as proposed by Mr. Alderete. You have the list before you.

AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Eureste, Alderete;

NAYS: Steen, Cockrell, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Canavan, Archer;

ABSENT: None.

CLERK: The motion failed on the amendment.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion failed. We now have the main motion. Mr. Wing.

MR. WING: When can I introduce my motion?

MAYOR COCKRELL: You may right now.

MR. WING: I want to speak to those Council persons that have been saying all along that they want to put money into capital improvements. I just want to tell you today, right now, that I know that this amount of money that this budget that I represent is not a whole lot of money as far as capital improvements is concerned, but at least you will be showing your symbolic approval for capital improvements and the fact that you know there is a dire, dire need for capital improvements not necessarily in the areas that you represent. Those areas that you represent, as some of you have spoken to the \$130 thousand that you have, \$130 thousand is not going to do very much in those areas. There have been people that have appeared before this Council the past few years and even earlier this year from all areas of the City of San Antonio, and I've seen the contingency fund being tapped for half a million dollars to go for projects on the north or northeast or northwest parts of town. So, I don't believe that we're addressing ourselves to the whole City of San Antonio and that's a role that you rose your hand to when you were elected that you would represent the entire City. There's no way that you can represent the entire City by trying to allocate \$130 thousand a piece. It just doesn't work.

I would appeal to the Mayor, as the leader of this City Council, that although what seemed last night to be a good idea and to bring some type of parity to the amount of money that was left over has produced a bastardized list of projects that you can't do anything with except put some people out of work. You cannot do anything meaningful with the amounts of money that they have allocated in that manner.

I would love to fund the entire amount of money for capital improvements. We tried that, we had four votes. We had three votes for this particular list that I'm presenting to you again. I would hope that the Council people that are here today would think about that, the people that stand to make it or break it as far as the social services agencies are concerned. There are no certain social service agencies that I'm beholding to, but I am beholding to one thing and my beholding is no different than yours, Mr. Canavan. I want capital improvements, but as an elected leader of the City of San Antonio I would implore that you change your mind. Your stance on capital improvement has certainly been made public, and I think that your vote to a symbolic capital improvements program out of this budget would certainly make your point.

I would also appeal to Mr. Steen, to Mr. Webb, that we do need your votes because the entire City of San Antonio needs it, and you don't know what the list contains. Give me a chance. Thank you.

DR. CISNEROS: If that's a motion, I'll second it.

MR. WING: That's a motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There is a motion by Mr. Wing and a second by - Mr. Wing, let's see, do you have that list?

MR. WING: The list as far as social service agencies are concerned the Institute of the Americas for \$45 thousand; the Advocates by Carlos Mata for \$20 thousand; the Mariachi Guadalupana for \$20 thousand; the Autistic Center for \$30 thousand; the Barrio Family Health Center for \$30 thousand; the Bexar County Women's Center for \$30 thousand; Big Brothers and Big Sisters for \$10 thousand; the Community Barrio Mural Program for \$38 thousand; Drug Abuse Central for \$50 thousand; Ella Austin for \$120 thousand; the HOW Foundation for \$30 thousand; Historic Building Conservation for \$75 thousand; Inman Christian Center for \$50 thousand; MANCO for \$100 thousand; the Mexican-American Unity Council for \$225 thousand; the Oblate Film Festival for \$10 thousand; the San Antonio Ballet for \$100 thousand; the Free Clinic for \$30 thousand; and the United Organizations Coalition for \$100 thousand; and Centro Del Barrio for \$145 thousand. That's the social service agencies.

Harlandale Park for \$100 thousand; West Mayfield Street for \$100 thousand; Library Engineering - Nogalitos and Park \$50 thousand; Anton Street resurfacing \$50 thousand; and the rest of the total which comes approximately to \$133,183 for Edgewood District 6 streets. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL : All right, there's been a motion and a second. Mrs. Dutmer. The Chair would like to urge that - if we can talk for less than 5 minutes, that we do it.

MRS. DUTMER: Madam Mayor, my light was on, because I don't remember this and I want to address the overall budget.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. I'll come back to you. Mr. Webb.

MR. WEBB: My light was on simply for the list.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Dr. Cisneros. No, I beg your pardon, Mr. Alderete is next, I missed him. Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Madam Mayor, I'll pass at this particular time. I want to discuss another item.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes. I want to speak very, very strongly for Mr. Wing's amendment on the grounds that while it doesn't include the things that I would like to see funded completely and while the capital improvements have absolutely nothing to do with the area I represent I think it's a much better package than the alternative precedent, and I'm really worried about that precedent. What I worry about is for the first time really that the Council members now have the opportunity to distribute money individually. That's a whole new day, a whole new change in our system. Never through the tumultuous periods of the 50's, never through the initiation of the districting system in '77, and never through the tumultuous period of '77 - '79 have Council members had it within their power to make individual spending decisions. I think it raises some very serious questions. The Charter isn't set up that way. Every single money decision has been made by the Council if it exceeds a level of money. Every decision has been one that has been endorsed by six persons. Instead what we're doing is giving discretion with respect to dollars. I think there's a question of principal raised here of the proper way of administering the City's fiscal affairs.

I would want to know how it's going to work under the original motion. What if the Traffic Director in a case says that a traffic light is not warranted in a location, but a Council member is receiving political pressure that that's where the light is to be, and he has the money in his kitty to put it at that location.

My question, I guess, is to the City Attorney first and that is whether the appropriate sections of the Charter that deal with distribution of monies, would you see any difficulty with that section and the action that we're going to be utilizing or the practice that we'll be utilizing henceforth.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I see the City Manager's light, and I didn't know if he wanted to comment first.

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: Well, what I'm going to say is probably what the City Attorney will say. In terms of approving the expenditure of funds anything over \$3 thousand is going to have to have Council action on it. So, in that sense it really isn't totally up to the Council member how those funds in his district gets spent. It's still going to have the approval of a whole Council. Correct, Jane?

CITY ATTORNEY MACON: You're merely by the action that the Council did last night you are earmarking those funds. Those funds that are set up in unallocated, in other words, contingency accounts would later be more specified as to specific allocations; but you're allocating those funds at this point just into certain categories, Dr. Cisneros, not making a commitment as to one thing or another. You're still going to have to come back to the Council for those six votes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Archer.

MR. ARCHER: I wanted to say that I really don't know too much about any - well I know nothing about any of these agencies, but some of the names keep cropping up from time to time, and I don't mean to be picking on anyone in particular, but if you fellows had gone out and gone door to door and said that you were going to put up \$100 thousand or whatever to teach ballet most of you would not have been elected, and you wouldn't be here today.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the Chair is going to ask if we would not single individual particular agencies out for particular comment.

MR. ARCHER: Well, I mean, I had two or three, but I won't say anything else about that. But one of my main concerns about these agencies, and I think this gets right down to the nut of it, is that I think about 75% of this money that everybody wants to earmark for agencies goes to pay some executive directors, and it's not really; so, it's not really not all that much that's going out to help needy people. That's all.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I wasn't going to say anything, but you know me. When Dr. Cisneros addressed the question of \$130 thousand not being enough to do anything in any district, I would submit to you, of course, this was pointing to District 6 and that \$130 thousand can sidewalk your entire district which I have heard many of the people come up here and plead for.

MR. THOMPSON: Amen.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I'll pass.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. The question then if there is no further discussion on the amendment as offered by Mr. Wing. Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, let me propose an amendment, Madam Mayor. Can we possibly, I don't know if I'll get a second to it, can we separate the agencies from the capital improvements? I would like to propose that as an amendment and see if I get a second on it. Separate both, in other words, have a decision on the agencies first and then the capital improvements second.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It would appear that that would be changing the motion. The motion was made as a package and all others have been considered as a package in that context.

MR. ALDERETE: It's not legally proper to propose an amendment that it be divided? If it doesn't receive a second I can understand it, but...

MAYOR COCKRELL: You're requesting that the question be divided in two parts and the Chair will rule that in this and other cases the question has been considered as a whole and so you're welcome to appeal the ruling.

MR. ALDERETE: No, I don't want to appeal the ruling; I just want to make that point.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we do have the motion then on the amendment by Mr. Wing. The Clerk will call roll.

YES: Cisneros, Wing, Eureste, Thompson;

NAYS: Steen, Cockrell, Webb, Dutmer, Canavan, Archer;

ABSTAIN: Alderete.

PRESENT: None.

CLERK: The motion failed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion failed. We now come to the main motion of the adoption of the budget. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam. I needed to allocate my money so that people aren't going to, you know, .....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, in other words, you'd like to offer a change in what was listed to the amount.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam. Can we give amounts of a thousand dollars or that would not look proper.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The Chair is perfectly willing to hear your suggestions, your recommendations.

MR. EURESTE: Well, I was thinking of giving \$1 thousand to each agency, and then the difference I would like to give - I need to give at least \$35 thousand to the Unity Council, and at least \$70 thousand to Centro Del Barrio because they are not covered at all, whatsoever. They have a program right now which they'll probably be losing from 10 to 12 workers if they do not get this funding.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now, then, for the Mexican-American Unity Council you were recommending what amount?

MR. EURESTE: \$35 thousand.

MAYOR COCKRELL: \$35 thousand, and then for Centro del Barrio?

MR. EURESTE: \$70 thousand.

MAYOR COCKRELL: \$70? All right, that makes \$105 then there was 25 - then you wanted \$1 thousand to each agency. Are there 25 agencies, is that correct? What is the total number of agencies?

MR. EURESTE: I need to count them.

MR. STEEN: Seventeen.

MR. EURESTE: I was talking about this major list.

MAYOR COCKRELL: On the major list?

MR. EURESTE: All right, with the exception of UOC because they are already funded at the full capacity, with the exception of Drug Abuse Central because their bottom line was 50 and they're at 65, and with the exception of Big Brothers and Sisters because they are at 12 and that is what they had requested.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, has the staff made those notations. The amounts then would be \$35 thousand to Mexican American Unity Council; \$70 thousand to Centro Del Barrio; \$1 thousand each to each of the agencies with the exception of Big Brothers and Sisters, Drug Abuse Central and United Organizations Coalition. Is it necessary, just can we state that orally and it will be incorporated? All right, fine. Thank you, sir. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: If we're going to be held to the things that we have here, if we're going to be held to the things that we have listed here, and that was my understanding, is that correct?

MAYOR COCKRELL: After the budget is adopted, if the Council member who made the nomination wishes to come in and request a change it could be considered just as any other budget change...

MRS. DUTMER: Oh, that's all right, that's fine.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If there was something that you wanted to make very specific,.....

MRS. DUTMER: No, my problem is that I don't know how much these sidewalks are going to cost.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Madam Mayor, I'd like to just present one other change. In my particular budget presentation I had \$20 thousand going to Drug Abuse Central, I'd like to leave \$5 thousand there and put \$15 thousand in the Mexican-American Unity Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the alteration then is deleting....

MR. ALDERETE: Drug Abuse from \$20 thousand of my share down to \$5 which brings them to their bottom line of \$50, and giving \$15 of that \$20 thousand to the Mexican-American Unity Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Noe, did you get those changes? A deletion of \$15 thousand from the Drug Abuse Central which is to be added to the Mexican-American Unity Council at the request of Councilman Alderete.

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: We've got it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Wing.

MR. WING: Yes, \$50 thousand to W. Mayfield Street Project; and \$35 thousand to the Barrio Mural Program; \$15 thousand to Centro Del Barrio; \$15 thousand for the Mexican-American Unity Council and \$15 thousand to MANCO.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I want to make sure that was picked up by the staff.

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: Yes, we've got that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. May I ask for Council members who are asking for changes, if you don't mind just double checking just for the benefit of the staff if you will write it down and also hand it to staff that way we won't have any error in understanding. Mr. Webb.

MR. WEBB: Yes. My proposal was \$105 thousand for Ella Austin Community Center and \$25 thousand for 1 Chance Halfway House, that's \$130 thousand leaving an additional \$50 thousand, \$25 thousand for an agency to come up to the requested amount of funds.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, sir. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes. Last evening I indicated adding \$30 thousand to the Institute of the Americas and I'd like to reduce that to \$15 of the \$30 that was indicated last night which would take that to \$45 thousand and that would be the equivalent of one half year's funding and put the additional \$15 thousand in the Mexican-American Unity Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, may we make that change. Any other changes? All right, at this point, again, we just ask everyone in double checking to make sure that staff got the figures correctly if you'll pass your list to the staff. If there are no further questions, suggestions or comments, the Clerk will call the roll on the adoption of the budget.

MRS. DUTMER: Madam Mayor. I do have further questions.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Oh, I beg your pardon, I'm sorry.

MRS. DUTMER: In the bringing the classifications up and going through the material that you gave us for the classifications I noticed that and the reason for it is because I was in that field, I noticed that Clerk Typist I had various levels of pay and that Clerk Typist II, but Secretaries were generally the same with the exception of Executive Secretaries which is a different category, I realize, but in the typists there were different levels of pay for it. In different departments there were different levels of pay.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Are you talking about the range or the specific salary?

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: There is only one salary range for a given classification.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, that's what I thought but then they're different in different departments.

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: Well, of course, because there are people at different grades within different steps within that range.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, you didn't address that at the time it was a blanket thing put in there - the document you gave us was just a blanket thing.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If there are no further questions, the Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell;

NAYS: Wing, Archer;

ABSENT: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right the motion carried and the budget for the next year is adopted.

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mrs. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Wing.

AN ORDINANCE 51,045

ADOPTING A BUDGET AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS  
IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,894,644 FOR THE 11TH  
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD, GENERAL REVENUE SHARING  
PROGRAM.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,046

INCREASING CERTAIN FEES FOR THE COLLECTION  
AND TRANSPORTATION OF GARBAGE AND ADDING A  
FEE FOR ALLEY SERVICES BY AMENDING SECTION  
5 OF CHAPTER 17 OF THE CITY CODE.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Alderete made an amendment to the motion to suspend the \$2.00 alley fee, pending a report from the staff on the ad-valorem tax situation. Mr. Archer seconded the motion.

Mr. Archer stated that citizens pay property taxes, and he felt that the garbage service should not be self-sustaining.

After discussion, the amendment to the motion failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Alderete, Archer; NAYS: Cisneros, Webb, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; ABSTAIN: Dutmer; ABSENT: None.

The following citizen spoke regarding the Ordinance:

Mr. E.L. Richey spoke against the proposed \$2.00 fee for alley pick-up. He asked if alleys could be used by the citizens since they are not being used by the refuse trucks. He further stated that alleys should be used for the purpose they were built.

After discussion, Mr. Thompson made an amendment to the motion that if property owners could show that they are being taxed on their alley property, then that tax will be removed if they are paying the alley pickup fee. Mr. Archer seconded the motion.

Mayor Cockrell spoke against the amendment because she felt that this would cause a mass confusion of people coming in and trying to figure what their taxes were. She expressed concern for this motion in its present form.

Mr. Thompson stated that the object is to eliminate the tax burden on persons who have alley pickup.

After discussion, the amendment to the main motion failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Dutmer, Thompson, Alderete, Archer; NAYS: Webb, Wing, Eureste, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; ABSENT: Cisneros.

The main motion to approve the Ordinance failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Wing, Eureste, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Dutmer, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer; ABSENT: Cisneros.

July 26, 1979

mb

Mayor Cockrell informed the Council that a balanced budget no longer existed as a result of this vote.

City Manager Huebner read from the City Charter regarding the situation of an unbalanced budget.

A discussion then took place among a few of the Council members as to what action could be taken.

Mr. Canavan then stated that he was against the \$2.00 increase; however, for the sake of the situation that has arisen, he would move for reconsideration of the Ordinance. Mrs. Dutmer concurred with Mr. Canavan and seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion to reconsider carried by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Alderete, Archer; ABSENT: Cisneros.

After further discussion, the main motion to approve the Ordinance carried by the following vote: AYES: Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Webb, Alderete, Archer; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-36 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete.

AN ORDINANCE 51,047

REVISING ELECTRIC GOLF CART RENTAL FEES OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,048

AMENDING THE BUILDING CODE (CHAPTER 10)  
OF THE CITY CODE BY ESTABLISHING PLAN  
CHECKING FEES COVERING CERTAIN PLANS AND  
SPECIFICATIONS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,049

REVISING CERTAIN LICENSE, PERMIT FEES AND  
RATES CHARGED FOR VARIOUS CITY ACTIVITIES  
IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 79-36-75

REQUESTING THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS  
AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TO MODIFY PLANS  
FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF U.S. HIGHWAY 90  
EXPRESSWAY.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Eureste moved to approve the Resolution. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

Mr. Joe Perales, representing Collins Gardens and the St. Henry's church area, expressed his gratitude to the City Council for the passage of this resolution.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Resolution, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete, Archer.

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Webb, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete, Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 51,050

REJECTING CHAPTER IV OF THE MASTER PLAN AS SUBMITTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, AND REFERRING SAME BACK TO THE COMMISSION FOR REVISION.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The following Resolutions were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete, Archer.

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 79-36-76

MANIFESTING THE DETERMINATION OF THE CITY COUNCIL THAT INVESTORS BUILDING CORPORATION HAS VESTED RIGHTS UNDER ARTICLE THREE OF ORDINANCE NO. 48484.

\* \* \* \*

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 79-36-77

MANIFESTING THE DETERMINATION OF THE CITY COUNCIL THAT MR. CHARLES J. JORDAN HAS VESTED RIGHTS UNDER ARTICLE THREE OF ORDINANCE NO. 48484.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Wing, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete, Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 51,051

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH GERALD C. HENCKEL, TO ACT AS LEGISLATIVE LIAISON FOR A TERM OF TWO (2) YEARS AT A CONSIDERATION OF \$35,500 PER ANNUM PLUS AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$15,000 PER ANNUM FOR AUTHORIZED EXPENSES; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mrs. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Wing, Alderete.

AN ORDINANCE 51,052

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF HYDROBLASTER, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WITH A HYDROBLASTER FOR A TOTAL OF \$10,965.31, LESS 1% - 10 DAYS.

\* \* \* \*

79-36 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Canavan, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Alderete.

A RESOLUTION  
NO. 79-36-78

ADOPTING PROCEDURES FOR THE RESOLUTION OF GRIEVANCES CONCERNING COUNCIL MEMBERS OR THE CITY MANAGER.

\* \* \* \*

79-36

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. GARY HUTTON

Mr. Gary Hutton, representing the North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, read to the Council a Resolution approved by the Board expressing their support for a Municipal Facility to house professional baseball and other community activities.

Mr. Webb stated that Mr. Wally Moon, owner of the San Antonio Dodgers had met with him and Dr. Cisneros on a similar matter. He said that the Resolution presented today will be referred to the Fiesta Committee.

Mr. Wing spoke in support of the resolution.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that she would be presenting this resolution to the Southeast Development Foundation.

(A copy of this resolution is on file with the minutes of this meeting.)

MR. JUAN VILLARREAL

Mr. Juan Villarreal, 514 Cantrell, explained that he had been issued a warning citation for selling fruit in the corner of Roosevelt and Southcross. He stated that he had spoken with David Casas from the City Attorney's Office, who had informed him that a change in the Peddler's Ordinance will not allow people to sell ice cream or snow cones.

Mr. Steve Arronge, Assistant City Attorney, stated that he had checked with the Health Department and that Mr. Villarreal was given a warning citation. Mr. Arronge stated that peddlers need a food establishment license and are not allowed to have any kind of a structure erected to sell their fruit or produce. He further stated that the ordinance prohibiting flower peddlers or peddlers on certain streets would be considered in a few weeks.

A discussion then took place among a few of the Council members on the proposed ordinance that will cover amendments that prohibit peddlers from operating on certain thoroughfares.

Mrs. Dutmer mentioned the growing number of garage sales in the northside area, which are slowly becoming a city-wide problem.

MRS. CAROLYN CUTTINGHAM

Mrs. Cuttingham asked the Council about the status of the citizens' request for an EMS Unit and a Fire Station in the Thousand Oaks/San Pedro Hills Area.

Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, referred to a report included in the Council's packet. He stated that the total cost for a fire station and EMS Unit would amount to \$1,250,000. The operating maintenance cost would be \$500,000.00.

Mr. Steen stated that a "B" Session is scheduled for discussion regarding the need for a Capital Improvement Bond Issue. This project would probably be included in District 10.

MR. MARVIN NIPPER

Mr. Marvin Nipper also spoke in support of the needed fire station and EMS Unit in this area. He stated that many recreational and cultural activities are being funded and that the needed projects such as this were being ignored.

MR. JOHN VALKO

Mr. John Valko reiterated the statements made by Mrs. Cuttingham.

DR. RICHARD WILSON

Dr. Wilson spoke about the development expansion in their area and the fact that no fire stations or EMS Units have been added. He spoke of an incident in which an EMS unit did not respond to an injured person within 20 minutes and the fact that the child died. He stated that they are unable to obtain city services and asked if it were possible to consider a contract with Hollywood Park, for use of their station. He also stated that in the future, bond issues should be specifically tied to pertinent projects.

Mrs. Dutmer asked if a contract could be drawn up to see if an EMS Unit could be stationed at Hollywood Park Fire Station.

Mayor Cockrell asked to see what contractual arrangements could be made on Mrs. Dutmer's suggestion.

MRS. BILLIE JEAN CROSS

Mrs. Cross spoke to the Council about the citation that they had received in connection with their business of selling fruits and vegetables. They were cited because they had erected some shades and the food inspectors considered this a food establishment.

Mr. Eureste stated that Mrs. Cross had spoken to him about his case. He referred to a report prepared by Mr. G.H. Scherwitz, Director of the Environmental Health Division. (A copy of this report is on file with the minutes of this meeting.)

Mayor Cockrell stated that a meeting could be set up between interested parties and the staff on what action transpired.

MR. JOHN SPURLOCK

Mr. Spurlock reiterated Mrs. Cross' statements.

79-36 The meeting was recessed at 6:00 P.M. and reconvened at  
6:45 P.M.

79-36 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,053

EXTENDING THE CONTRACT WITH THE BARRIO  
BETTERMENT & DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR  
OPERATING AN URBAN RAT CONTROL PROGRAM  
UNTIL AUGUST 31, 1979.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Alderete moved to approve the Ordinance. Mrs. Dutmer  
seconded the motion.

It was noted that this Ordinance was approved with the comment  
that staff will communicate with Barrio Betterment Development Corporation  
that the contract will be terminated within 30 days.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage  
of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer,  
Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell;  
NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-36 The Clerk read the following Letter:

July 23, 1979

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

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

July 13, 1979

Petition submitted by Tom Bondurant,  
San Antonio Academy, requesting the  
City Council to review Case No. 1093  
of the Board for Review for Historic  
Districts and Landmarks.

July 13, 1979

Petition submitted by Stanley Godoy,  
requesting permission to enclose the  
alley behind his home.

/s/ G.V. JACKSON, JR.  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Council,  
the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

*G.V. Jackson, Jr.*  
City Clerk

*Lila Cockrell*  
M A Y O R

July 26, 1979