

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1976.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A. M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: PYNDUS, BILLA, CISNEROS, BLACK, HARTMAN, ROHDE, TENIENTE, NIELSEN, COCKRELL; Absent: NONE.

76-34 The invocation was given by The Reverend Valentine Scherrer, San Jose Mission Church.

76-34 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

76-34 Consideration of the minutes of the meeting of July 15, 1976, was postponed for one week.

76-34 SISTER CITIES CONFERENCE

Councilman Teniente introduced Mr. Jose Manuel Moreno, a visitor from Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico. Mr. Moreno is in charge of a publication and is visiting San Antonio to gather information for a feature story about San Antonio.

Mr. Moreno presented Mayor Cockrell with a gift and invited her to attend the Sister Cities Conference to be held in Guadalajara during the week of July 28 to August 1, 1976.

Mayor Cockrell thanked Mr. Moreno for the beautiful gift and the invitation. She also thanked Councilman Teniente for his outstanding participation in the Sister Cities Program.

76-34 CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FLAG

Mayor Cockrell introduced a Resolution adopting the flag designed by Mr. William H. Herring and presented to the City on April, 1935, as the official flag of the City of San Antonio. She stated that through a search of the minutes of the City Council, it was determined that no action had ever been taken to officially adopt the flag and stated that this Resolution was in order.

The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 76-34-54

ADOPTING AN OFFICIAL FLAG FOR THE
CITY OF SAN ANTONIO.

* * * *

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Billa, the Resolution was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

Councilman Hartman read a proposed Resolution commending the Planning Commission upon completion of the Public Hearing on the Master Plan and urging continued citizen participation in the Master Planning Process and asked that it be placed on the July 29, 1976 Agenda for consideration by the City Council.

76-34

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 42 (ZONING)
OF CITY CODE

Mayor Cockrell declared open a Public Hearing.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed changes which adds City Council approval for riding stables, riding academies, boarding stables, et cetera. It also stipulates that these uses are not to be allowed over the Edwards Recharge Zone. Mr. Camargo also stated that the Zoning Commission has recommended its approval.

Mr. Denton Belt, 840 East Mulberry, spoke in favor of the proposed changes and urged the Council to approve the Ordinance.

No one spoke in opposition.

The Mayor declared the hearing closed.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46908

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 SO AS TO PROVIDE NEW LISTINGS IN THE TABLE OF PERMITTED USES FOR "RACE TRACKS, RODEOS, AND OTHER COMPETITIVE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES CENTERED AROUND HORSES" AND "RIDING STABLES, RIDING ACADEMIES, HORSE TRAINING FACILITIES AND BOARDING STABLES", SPECIFYING THE ZONES IN WHICH SUCH USES SHALL BE ALLOWED, AND DELETING THE PRESENT LISTING OF "RIDING STABLE OR ACADEMY".

* * * *

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Rohde, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

76-34

CITY WATER BOARD
REVENUE BONDS

CITY CLERK: Mayor Cockrell, we have two Ordinances under Item VII. I'll read them one at a time.

AN ORDINANCE 46,909

DIRECTING THE PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ISSUE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WATER REVENUE BONDS IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$8,000,000.

* * * *

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Yes, sir, Mr. Van Dyke.

MR. ROBERT VAN DYKE: I am Robert Van Dyke, General Manager of the City Water Board. On the tenth of June, after review of our needs for a \$15 million borrowing program, you directed that proper notice be given for the issuance of bonds not to exceed \$15,000,000. This would be the initial step in carrying out the bond program that was presented to you. In the development of the schedules, and the estimated monthly requirements for carrying out the proposed bond program, we found that it would be better if this bond issue were split. Our bond consultants also have analyzed the relative market and credit impact on this proposed issuance of these bonds and concur with this finding.

This matter was considered by the Water Works Board of Trustees on the 13th of July and, based upon the studies and reviews made by the Board and by the Board's consultants, it is recommended to the Council that we break the bond issue into two issues, an \$8,000,000 issue which would be sold on the 9th of September and \$7,000,000 issue which would be sold on the 26th of May, 1977. This will fit with the flow of funds and the construction and we feel that it will enable the City Water Board to maintain its AA rating for the issuance of bonds and ultimately will provide a lower interest rate which will accrue benefits to all of the citizens. The two Ordinances that you have before you allow the bonds to be sold in this manner and sets forth a notice of these sales. It is the request of the Water Works Board of Trustees that you act favorably on these two Ordinances.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, is there a discussion.

DR. NIELSEN: I move for adoption of the Ordinance.

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes, madam. I did have a question, and it relates to a decision that was made about two weeks ago now by this Council relative to extension policies and so forth. Now, as I remember the discussion, Mr. Van Dyke, we broke it out into three different sections. We talked about materials, on-site materials, we talked about the extensions of laterals and we talked about the approach mains. My understanding of the action that we took, we cut out completely the provision of materials, free materials, we took the whole question of extension of laterals and limited that to within City usage and also a stipulation that there would be this \$300 connection charge and that the whole program of extension of laterals would be worked on a true revolving fund basis of \$300 connection charge applying to that. Then with respect to the issue of approach mains, we did indicate that since that was not a reimbursable item, that that money would continue to come from the General Fund and, additionally, there would be some bond fund allocation to that program. Is that correct?

MR. VAN DYKE: All but the very last thing.

DR. CISNEROS: That is what I need clarification on.

MR. VAN DYKE: For the approach mains, the repayment would come from on-site connections and pro rata connections to the approach mains.

DR. CISNEROS: Okay, now on the pro rata connections, which is money that will be coming from the General Fund, and I assume that there will be some bond allocations to that, too, is that correct?

MR. VAN DYKE: It's possible. But, it would be mixed funds, both in bonds or from revenues.

DR. CISNEROS: Okay, now that leads me into the question about the pro rata connection. What is the pro rata connection?

MR. VAN DYKE: Mr. Shields is telling me from the accounting standpoint there are no bond funds involved in this.

DR. NIELSEN: At least that's where everything is at the moment. Right? There would be no bond funds involved.

DR. CISNEROS: In other words, you are able to separate out bond funds from other General Funds...(inaudible)... Okay, at some point I would like to pursue a line of questioning as to the per lineal foot charge on the approaches or per lineal foot actual cost on the approaches. I am told that it is somewhat relevant to this discussion, I am told that though you have budgeted the per lineal foot cost at "X" amount, that it is coming in at something quite a bit more than that in the new areas because of the different geography and topography in which the actual approaches are being put in. Can you comment on that?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes. The per lineal foot cost is based on actual cost. We recognize that is a changing thing and that with the inflation that we are experiencing, and the relative demand as far as contractors' work, that there are times when this goes up and sometimes it's down.

DR. CISNEROS: What do you use as a guideline?

MR. VAN DYKE: It is based on the average cost over past years.

DR. CISNEROS: Which is, what figure?

MR. VAN DYKE: Right now, it would be \$8.50 for six inch mains. That is a charge of \$4.25 on either side of the street. But that figure and all of the charges that vary with changing times are subject to revision by the Board as a part of our regulation whenever the past practice shows that they are not correct, or that they are changing enough that warrants a change in those schedules.

DR. CISNEROS: Thank you very much. I want to pursue that at some point, but the point is, however, as Mr. Shields indicates that it is not relevant.

MR. VAN DYKE: That is correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine.

MR. HARTMAN: I would also like to see us pursue that subject in more detail. Did I understand you correctly, \$8.50 per foot on a six inch main?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, and probably the present cost is up around \$10.00 per foot, but again, Mr. Hartman, it depends on demand on contractors. If the market is flooded with work then they bid higher, or if they are starved for work, well, then they will bid lower and so there is considerable variation on these prices.

MR. HARTMAN: But you said \$8.50 was based upon a

MR. VAN DYKE: Past experience.

MR. HARTMAN: Past experience over how long such time?

MR. VAN DYKE: At the time that we did that and set that price, I think we had about two or two and a half years experience that we had used, because certainly it has to be over a relatively short period of time to reflect inflation. Those figures are all subject to correction from time to time if we see that they are too low.

MR. HARTMAN: Without belaboring here, I do think this is a real pertinent point that needs to be discussed, and I would like to see us pursue it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. We do have one citizen registered. I will call first on Mr. Pyndus and then we will call on Mr. Karl Wurz who is registered to speak.

MR. PYNDUS: To clarify that point, Bob, we made a decision which affected the Community Water Development Fund, and, in essence, we reduced the City Water Budget. The budget was reduced because there were some services that we provided previously that we will not provide now. Now, however, before that decision was made we had an increase in water rates. That water rate increase was set at a certain figure and now our expenses, our budget has been reduced by the decision we made last week. By reducing the functioning of that City Water Development Fund. Now, we are maintaining the \$15,000,000 Bond requirements, only we are going at it in a two step approach. How will the water rates be affected by the decision we made last week, in changing the operation of that City Water Development Fund?

MR. VAN DYKE: That the Water Revenue Bonds that are affected here would not be affected by that. We have not yet had an opportunity to officially change the regulations to reflect the Council's wishes and momentarily the change in the revenues of the Water Board for the remainder of this year would not be affected until that can take place, and I really haven't had an opportunity to sit down and analyze just exactly the economic effect on it, but that will be done. So, I would like to answer that question a little bit later.

MR. PYNDUS: All right, fine.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. At this time, then we will call on Mr. Karl Wurz who is registered to speak.

MR. KARL WURZ: As you well know, I have appeared here numerous times to oppose bond sales without receiving proper response to my pleas and to the facts I have presented this Council. You continue to ignore the cries of agony and distress of the people.

I have been saying let's get off bond sales which produces an interest debt that makes us poorer and let's get on a pay-as-you-go basis. I have been saying these bond sales also increases the sales tax of which the City will get its cut. I have been saying because of the bond sales the City continues to receive a bigger cut of the economic pie through the in lieu of taxes payment from the Water Board.

It does all of this automatically with your consent, and the citizens can't say anything where it really counts - in a bond election. But do you listen? Do you respond?

I have brought to your attention the fact that a greater portion of taxes and utility bills is for the cost of borrowing and that we the people are paying for the privilege of borrowing money at high interest rates.

Consultants tell you and us the rates are not high, that they are low. If they didn't say this where would they be? They would be out of a job. But so long as they are employed in the selling of favorable views which benefit financial institutions. We the people will continue to get ripped-off by the interest debt. An interest debt which at times nearly equals, is equal to or exceeds the construction

costs. Doubling the construction costs does not double our pleasure. I would hope that you would cast a vote for the relief of the people. Thank you very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, sir. All right, are there any further questions of Mr. Van Dyke? If not, may we have a motion?

MR. VAN DYKE: May I clarify one point raised by Mr. Wurz that the City Water Board does not give one penny to the City of San Antonio, nor does it receive one penny from the City in lieu of taxes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion.

On roll call the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote:
 AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell;
 NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

MR. HARTMAN: Excuse me, Madam Mayor. Bob, now with this passage you can pay the City back that money that we lent you here a few months ago.

CITY CLERK: We have one more bond ordinance.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Oh, there was one more bond ordinance. I am sorry.

CITY CLERK: AN ORDINANCE 46,910

DIRECING THE PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF
 INTENTION TO ISSUE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
 WATER REVENUE BONDS IN THE PRINCIPAL
 AMOUNT OF \$7,000,000.

* * * *

DR. NIELSEN: I move adoption of the Ordinance.

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

On roll call the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote:
 AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell;
 NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

76-34 Mayor Cockrell announced that Items 40, 41 and 42 had been withdrawn from today's agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE
1976-77 BUDGET

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,911

ADOPTING THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1976-77, APPROPRIATING FUNDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SAID BUDGET, FIXING THE AUTHORIZED NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN EACH MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE, ADOPTING A NEW PAY PLAN, PROVIDING FOR A 5.5% SALARY INCREASE FOR ALL CITY EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN THOSE WHOSE SALARY IS DETERMINED THROUGH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACTS, AND PROVIDING THAT THESE EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE PAID IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUCH CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS AS AGREED UPON.

The following discussion took place:

CITY MANAGER SAM GRANATA: The City Charter requires that a public hearing be held on the Annual Operating Budget prior to its adoption.

Sound management is as necessary in government as it is in any business, and it demands the interest and involvement of every citizen of San Antonio. This public hearing affords the citizens an opportunity to become involved in the most important decisions facing the City Council each year. The City's program of services, which this budget represents, affects each citizen in some way or another.

In my opinion, the basic policy issues in the budget have been addressed. The budget totaling \$136,291,660 is based upon maintaining the Tax Rate at \$1.65 per \$100 valuation with a 45% assessment ratio; and it meets the needs of the community adequately, or at least as adequately as available finances will permit. It provides proper balance among various activities. The budget includes work programs which assure that adequate results will be produced and that adequate standards of service and administration will be maintained. The budget is sound and economical in all respects, and it discharges the City's responsibility to the future.

The budget provides an across-the-board wage increase to all City employees. While it is true that not all classes of City employees are receiving the same amount of percentage increase, it should be emphasized that through collective bargaining the Police Uniform personnel will be receiving about an 8.8% increase. However, in order to fund this added cost the Department is having to make up the additional funds required for this increase through attrition in the work force. The net result is that there is no increase in the Police Department budget because of the trade-offs that were agreed to through the collective bargaining process.

Following the public hearing any changes or adjustments in the proposed budget that the Council desires to make can be made in the Ordinance before its passage, and the official document will be revised to reflect those changes by reprinting those pages that are affected by the changes.

I suggest that we proceed by hearing those citizens that have signed the register. Your administrative staff stands ready to answer any questions of the Council or the citizens at this time.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Granata, I would like to start out by bringing out some of the further discussions regarding our City employee benefits. I would like to make a few statements and then I would like to ask for you or your staff to make certain comments. As background, as you know, the City Council has the final authority and responsibility for the adoption of the City budget and I know it is the desire and the wish of the Council to be fair in its relations to its employees and to provide as well as we are able to for these employees through our budget process. The manner in which this is done is that the City Manager has reviewed the budget and has made certain recommendations.

Now, over and above that process, there is the additional process which we are following under the provisions of the State law and also through the local referendum process where the firefighters and the police officers were given collective bargaining rights through the assent of the voters in our area. So they are under different provisions through both the State law and the local referendum than are other category of employees.

Now operating under all of these rules and in trying to be fair to all, an agreement has been reached with the Police Officers Association relative to the pay scale. As Mr. Granata has announced, that was accomplished without any increase overall in the police budget in terms of personnel due to shifts and reallocations within that department budget. It provides for a base rate and then, in addition, it provides for a senior patrolman differential and plan that averages out to an 8.8% as Mr. Granata had said. Now it is my understanding that as of this point in terms of the firefighters provisions the firefighters have not ratified the proposed contract and that the reason that they have stated publicly that they have not ratified it is that they are unwilling to concede their rights under the State laws, is that correct?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. I would like to say I think it is important for the City to make some statement about its provision relative to the rights of our employees under the State law. First of all, as a matter of legality, it is understanding that the City Attorney feels that the provision in that State law makes it very clear that in the bargaining process that if the option is given by the employees that there is ample provision for the State benefits to be waived if that is a part of the accepted package provided and agreed to on both sides in the bargaining process. Is that correct?

CITY ATTORNEY JIM PARKER: That's correct, Mayor Cockrell.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: For the current year's contract.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The second reason I think it is very important for the citizens to understand why the City Council has held firm on that request. The request that we have made of the firefighters that they agree, as the police officers did, for the life of that contract not to go back to the State and either request or accept additional benefits from the State. The reason is that it's very important for the City Council to know at the time it adopts its budget what its total requirements are going to be in terms of the pay plan that is available with benefits for any of its groups of employees. If we bargain in good faith and agree upon a pay package with a group of employees under this law, we feel that it is not protecting the overall citizens interest to leave something open-ended where that same group of employees can expect to receive additional benefits to be funded by the City but not at the option of the City, where the City would simply be required to adopt an open-ended package of what we do not

know what may occur in the next session of the legislature affecting those benefits. I think that it needs to be understood that in the final agreement, it is very important that the City have a package where it knows what the total package is going to be at the time it is agreed to and not where it is left open-ended that additional benefits can be gained at the State level but paid for by the citizens of San Antonio. I think that had to be stated very clearly.

Now in reviewing the options and the available funding for our other employees, certainly this is a matter of concern also to this City Council. One group of employees who has gone through the grievance procedure in expressing their concern about wages and benefits is the garbage workers. I felt a particular concern in this area that we look at the situation to be fair because they are among our hourly paid employees for the most part and I would like to ask - I have asked the City Manager and his staff to review in particular the wages paid this group of employees and to review what increases have been given over the past few years because I felt that we wanted to be sure that we were treating everyone fairly and I would like to ask Mr. Granata to have the results of that investigation made public.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Okay. With regards to the refuse driver, his average annual salary today without longevity is \$9,600 per year. His average salary with longevity is \$10,200 per year. With regard to the refuse collector or the pick-up man, without longevity, the annual salary is \$8,500 per year and with longevity it's \$8,600 per year. That's the current pay without the increase.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Without the increase. All right. And now what I'm asking is those figures

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: And this is actual money not including any of the fringe benefits which amounts to approximately 23 or 26 percent. That's annual leave, sick leave, etc.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. So then the 5.5 that is in the proposed budget would be added, of course, to the

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, madam, to this amount.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now then what I am asking for though is a review and a comparison over the past few years of the percentages of increase that have been granted.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Information furnished me was - in February of 1974 in comparison the fire and police received a 7.9 percent wage increase and the garbage driver and collector received a 5 percent. In August of 1974, because of the wage and hour law, the fire and police did not receive any raise, the driver and garbage collector received 15 percent. In October of 1974, the fire and police received 9.9 percent and the garbage driver and collector received a 6 percent. In November of 1975, the fire and police received a 5 percent and the garbage driver and collector a 5 percent. So from February '74 through November '75 the fire and police received 22.8 percent and the garbage driver and collector a 31 percent. The only one that's been approved so far for '76 for August 1 is the 8.8 percent average for the police. Of course from 6 percent from zero to 5 years and approximately 8.8 for the remainder. We do not have which would put them up for some up to 30 and some up to 28. I don't know what the fire will finally come out at and the proposed for the driver and the collector for the garbage is 5.5 which will put them at 36 1/2 percent.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. So if we add the 8.8 which the policy officers got, that makes it

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: 33.6%.

MAYOR COCKRELL: 31.6%.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: I mean 31.6 that's right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: 31.6 for the police officers as opposed to 36.5.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That would have been in that same period of time received by the refuse drivers and collectors.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, madam.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. I asked to have these figures made available to the Council since we have the entire matter under consideration. All right, are there any other comments that any Council member would like to make prior to opening for discussion. There is an additional report relative to some of the arts groups that the Council has received. We will then call for the citizens at this moment now and I'll call them. The first speaker registered is Kitty Anamosa, is that correct?

KITTY ANAMOSA: My name is Kitty Anamosa and I'm a physical therapist at the Robert B. Green Hospital. I'm speaking on behalf of the Arthritis Foundation and a request for funds for our mobile education unit for the chronically ill. This program will enable us to reach the aged and the home-bound and the disabled who need to know about arthritis. According to the Arthritis Foundation annual report, \$485 million a year are spent on quack cures for arthritis. There is an obvious cause to educate these people that there is no cure for arthritis but there are methods of treating it. We hope to reach a large portion of the people in this area, particularly the 250,000 arthritis victims in the South Texas area.

The request for funds will be used for capital expenditures only, including audio-visual equipment, some simple therapy equipment, a van and self-help equipment. Using this equipment the Arthritis Foundation volunteers will be able to reach the over 21 senior community centers and other centers where we can reach the people.

There is also going to be some space leased by the Arthritis Foundation in the South Texas Health Education Center for a permanent display. This display will also be manned by volunteers. Some of the equipment will be used for this display. CETA has provided funds for the persons who coordinate the program. I want to repeat that the money for this will be used only for capital expenditures and I'm prepared to answer any questions you have.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Kathy, there's a bit of confusion. Actually, this is item number 12 that you're referring to on the budget and somehow the topics or headings have been changed on the hearings Citizens to be Heard sheet. This and the cerebral palsy and the other two programs will be considered at item No. 12 and should we have them speak then

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, that will be on item No. 12 on the budget which refers to the Revenue Sharing on the Manager's items rather than in the general fund budget. Fine. Thank you so much.

At this time I'll call Nancy Smith. And I would like to just announce in connection with the San Antonio Ballet Company, the recommendation of the committee is that rather than funding through revenue sharing that a grant of capital funding of \$50,000 be given from the general fund budget and that is the pending recommendation from the committee.

MS. NANCY SMITH: I see. Is that instead of the revenue sharing listed there?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, that's correct.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, instead of the \$9,205, it's proposed to be increased to \$50,000 out of the general fund.

MS. SMITH: And the budget that we submitted for the revenue sharing then would no longer apply.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That's correct.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct.

DR. NIELSEN: Let me ask again, Sam, because I wasn't exactly clear this morning, this has all just been happening and I've been out of town, Nancy. Apparently, the \$20,000 request that I submitted through revenue sharing has just been eliminated

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's become part of the \$50,000.

DR. NIELSEN: It's included in the 50 which is not in addition to \$62.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Actually, they asked for \$62 and they're getting \$50,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, so that is the proposal. As it is now, it will be a total of \$50,000 in the general fund and will be handled that way.

MS. SMITH: I see. Well, for the record, I'm Assistant Director of the San Antonio Ballet Company, Nancy Smith. As much as we kidded about it last week, I think you should know my father's name really is Sam Smith and the reason we've been here every week now for the last couple of months and that we haven't given up is that the money we're requesting, the \$62,240 is badly needed. This isn't just for minor improvements or for some cost of living increases. These are to establish ballet on a professional level in San Antonio next to the music and opera and theater that we have. It's to begin providing jobs for qualified - already qualified dancers. We're still here and we haven't gone away because we feel that ballet does have a place here among the arts. Thank you all very much for your attention and consideration.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Robert Thompson.

MR. ROBERT THOMPSON: Mayor Cockrell, and other City Council members. I appear before the City Council once again to ask that they approve an equal 8.8 percent pay increase to all hourly paid employees of the San Antonio Transit System, equal to the increase given to the police personnel of the City. I might reiterate there that a discussion with the Transit System yesterday, it was brought out that we are more than satisfied with 5.5 percent pay increase but we would like some additional to to into a benefit package, and that would bring it up to 8.8.

I wish to inform the City Council that starting on June 21 through July 21, I along with executive board have met with the management of the San Antonio Transit system for a total of 9 meetings discussing wages, hours and conditions of work with the Transit System offering us yesterday a definite 5.5 percent pay increase endorsed by the City Council. One month ago we all knew that this was the proposed 5.5% pay increase in the proposed City budget. So after 9 meetings with the Transit System, we have just been spinning our wheels. Transit management tells me that if more than 5.5% is to be forthcoming, the City Council must give them the okay on it.

July 22, 1976

387

lm

Actually, to give the personnel of the Transit System an 8.8% increase, would mean that the City only has to approve an outlay of 4.4 percent with matching federal funds making up the difference to 8.8 percent. I personally cannot understand why the City wants to offer each group of City employees a different percentage in wages and benefits.

Much comment was made by the City Council last Thursday about collective bargaining. Is this the reason the police and firefighters were offered more than other employee groups? I have to watch very carefully that the Police Association was offered more than any other employee group of employees in its campaign to the citizens of this fair City to give them collective bargaining rights promising that they would not unionize if these rights were approved by the voters.

It's ironic now that now in their first contract the Police Association is offered the most while the unionized groups affiliated with the AFL-CIO are offered less. Will the City management and the City Council and the City of San Antonio practice discrimination against unionized employee groups? Will the City management and the City Council of the City of San Antonio practice discrimination because some employee groups have collective bargaining while others only have collective begging. The Transit Union has put in a diligent effort in sitting down with the management of the San Antonio Transit System on nine occasions in this past month.....believing with enough effort, we could reach an agreeable solution and maybe do as we have had last year and reach an agreement with six days remaining before the expiration date, and avoid the unpleasantness of the past years which we can all recall very well. We have tried with myself addressing you also in the past two weeks in these very Chambers. I ask City Council to take a long, hard look at its budget and also to look at the points I have raised today. Your employees will be watching and waiting. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. Mr. Henry Munoz.

MR. HENRY MUNOZ: Madam Mayor, Gentlemen of the Council, for the record, I am Henry Munoz. I am District Director for ACME Locals here in San Antonio. I am the fellow that can come down here and we don't have, and I have stated, we don't have any collective bargaining rights. We collected these bags. And we are back here again asking the same thing that you probably received the letter this morning. We want 10 percent in the paycheck, and 7 percent applicable to insurance. Now, I could have filled this Hall today with a lot of people. I didn't want to do that because I got a very concerned call last Friday about a strike tomorrow. I don't know anything about it. Because I am going to let you decide what our fate is going to be. You make the decision and we take it up from there. There will be a meeting called and whatever you give us, then that is what we are going to report to the Executive Board but the members are going to know about it.

Let me say something, however, that according to those figures some of my men are going to be in a lot of trouble with their wives because that is not what they are getting in their paychecks. According to your own figures that was passed to something that I gave to you, some statistics that your staff had put together in 1974 they were 15 percent behind. 15 percent. We are talking about catching up and again I hear, well they have collective bargaining rights and we don't. Does it matter whether we have it or not when we go down to Handy Andy to see Charlie Becker. He will say no, put the money right on the line. Or go to Piggly Wiggly. That's what we are talking about. It's playing one against the other. I could have put our grievance that we want 300 additional pick-up men and 200 drivers and then I say you know what, you just give us 50, which is all you need right now. So we are not talking about that. I think that you figured we'd choke. I don't want to get into the arena of playing one against the other. You know, an old saying figures don't lie but liars can figure.

We are hurting right now. I think you know as well as we know it. I think it is very unfair that one segment because they have collective bargaining rights, get more than the little guy and we are not talking about just the garbage collectors. You know why you pay more attention to the garbage collectors? Because you don't want to be in garbage up to your eye balls. That is why. Because you want to clean the downtown and we will help you do it. Because the tourist doesn't like to see a dirty street. Yet we are being punished because we don't have that. And I am back here again. That whatever package you come up from, we want it equivalent to what we have asked you. Our cost of living is the same. But you tell us that they got so many percentages, well some of my people are paying \$50 and \$60 worth of gas and electricity. Our water rates went up 21 percent. We don't have any more telephones. We took them out. We are using Indian runners. We gave up smoke signals. So we can go round and round and round and round, and we are not only talking about the garbage collectors. What about the brush department? What about gravel and asphalt? What about your landfills? Don't they eat, don't they work? How about them? How about some of the employees that are not represented working in the office. They are excluded because they don't have, all right, we are back here again. There will be no strike, I give you my word. We will report. We are against coming back here begging, collective begging. But I will tell you what, we can insist on fair play from you and don't play one against the other because it won't sell. Thank you, so much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Munoz. Let me ask you a question. According to the figures that we have from the City Manager, at the present time, the lowest pay on the refuse collectors is \$8500. And with the 5.5 percent increase that would go up to around \$9,000 and then the drivers have a pay now of \$9600 and with 5.5 percent increase it would be about \$10,100 or something in that range.

MR. MUNOZ: Those aren't the figures that we have. We have submitted them to you in that package by your own study that you have here and that is not the wage scales we have. That is why I say

MAYOR COCKRELL: I am concerned about the alleged difference in the figures. That is what I want to get at. And because in addition to these figures, the staff will report of course that fringe benefits amount to something like is it 23 percent? And so that makes a very, certainly we would like for all of our employees to make you know as much as we could make available to them. But that does make certainly a beginning salary look

MR. MUNOZ: Well, if we are going to make sense and I am going to say this one more time, it's not that I am begging, workers shouldn't be subsidized in the City of San Antonio. Or in the County or anybody else. Every worker through his employer goes in there and bargains for fringe benefits, paid insurance for him and his family. Holidays. That is nothing new, it's standard procedure now adays. And it's taken into the package certainly - to what amount. How much is this, is going by spiraling of prices? I don't see any stability.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now, on the other point, according to the City's staff figures of the percentage of increases that have been granted with the current wage level that is proposed, you will be 5 percent ahead in percentage of the percentages granted to the Police Officers by comparison.

MR. MUNOZ: We can compare a lot of things. We had the many benefits that is going into that little package and I don't want to get into I am against policemen, I am against fire fighters, or bus drivers. I hear the rumbling you want to give us across whatever you want to. The decision is yours. But I want to tell you we need more money.

July 22, 1976

lm

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, so, thank you, yeah, right. Good. I just wanted to make some comments that the City is a very complicated thing to try to figure out what is, in fact, fair. You have tried to determine where people were when they started and what additional benefits have been granted and look at the whole picture and I am sure you realize it is a very difficult process. But I do appreciate your comments.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, Henry, I think that I can speak for the whole Council and that is we are not in the business of pitting one group of employees, those who have different legal positions versus those who do not. I do agree that there is a distinction. One thing collective bargaining does, it makes very, very formal this negotiating process. It doesn't preclude and both Mr. Franz and Clancy have been here standing where you are, it is just that we have a formal arena in which to deal with these things, not excluding the informal. Unfortunately, one of the problems of discussions over benefits and what have you are much more informal outside the collective bargaining process.

Everybody, I hope you hear this, and I think you know it, everybody got 5.5 percent. It just happened in the formal collective bargaining process with no increase in the overall budget, two groups who have collective bargaining got a little bit more in terms of their own paychecks but everybody is getting 5.5 percent. Now, let's just eliminate all this discussion from hereon about pitting one group against the other and see what in the world the City Council can or cannot do with the Manager's consent or advice, or whatever, relative to the inflationary problems, cost of living, increasing insurance, etc., etc. I would hope from this point on, that's where we begin our discussions and not pitting one group against the other.

MR. MUNOZ: Well Councilman, whatever that bargaining process and I don't have that, I stated repeatedly, what do you want us to give up? We ain't got nothing. You name it, we don't have it. We are talking about why should somebody else get more than, to the process to the ability to work, what created a super laborer. A super street cleaner. A super something then give us the money. That is that simple.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, it's both a question of money, but a formal legal process. I hope you,

MR. MUNOZ: Is it legal to present grievances concerning wages, I understand Article 5154.3 very clearly. Section 6 states that we have that right to present grievances concerning wages, conditions of work, fringe benefits provided we don't claim the right to strike. I've never done that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, thank you very much. Now, then those are all the citizens that are registered that I have here on the budget. Are you interested in the budget, let me look. All right, okay, I am sorry, you were registered on four different things and I guess I overlooked that you were registered on this one. Fine, all right, and then I see Helen Walter also. So we will call on Mr. Wurz and then Helen Walter.

MR. KARL WURZ: Good morning, once again. My name is Karl Wurz. If I do have an abundance of words, it is because I do have something to gripe about. The cost of living pay raise is another thing I have to grip about. I had hoped by now you would have admitted the cost of living pay raise is unfair to the City's wage earners as well as to the tax payer. The records will show that I have presented hard evidence that the cost of living pay raise administered on a percentage basis is inequitable. It not only creates a great social injustice for the low wage earners, it rips off tax payers and consumers of gas, electricity and water through the bills they pay.

The public is being victimized by irrationality. Irrationality based on ones own fals notions not guided by laws or rules which make common sense. If you know of any justification which makes any percentage increase across the board a right and just increase then by God reveal it. It's a

ridiculous notion to try to justify any employee getting a 400, 300, or 200 percent increase over another employee.

There exists a critical need to deal fairly and equally with employees and citizens. As captains of this City you must remove us from the dangerously harmful course which has led numerous Cities to the brink of bankruptcy. We cannot continue on this annual vicious cycle and expect the roof not to cave in on us. The yearly demands for cost of living pay raises are maliciously destructive. It tears down instead of building up. It makes life meaner for those living in poverty and near poverty. It causes the transition of squalor from word to reality as high wage earners surge away from them.

Today you have the opportunity to be unique in daring to tear down the economic curtain which separates one human being from another. Begin today to make the right decision. Tomorrow the next one may be easier. I know of no better place for wage reform to begin. It is like charity, it should begin at home. It is my hope that San Antonio will take the lead and others will follow. For now it will be enough that you do the right thing, dollar for dollar, by not giving one employee more than another.

Let me give you an example about how unjust this percentage wage increase is. If you take 10 percent of \$20,000, that is a \$2,000 a year increase. If you take 10 percent of \$15,000 that is \$1,500 per year. If you take 10 percent of \$10,000, that is \$1,000. If you take 10 percent of \$5,000 that is \$500. There is a whole lot of difference between \$2,000, \$1,500, \$1,000 and \$500. There is just no equity in percentage of increases across the board. Thank you, very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you sir.

DR. NIELSEN: Karl, I think you have raised a good point. We have discussed this off and on the last year or so in terms of at least one institution in town I know that did modify or slightly invert the process of across the board increase to raise a bit more the percentage figure on the lower end and deminish it a bit on the upper end and it can be done. Thank you for your suggestion again.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Helen Walter.

MRS. HELEN WALTER: Good morning. I am Helen Water of 5286 Round Table Drive. As the wife of a federal employee, I would like to speak very briefly upon this 5.5 percent salary increase. We of the federal service have had to content ourselves with a 5.4, 5.6, 5.5 increase in salary for years. Inasmuch as you will have thousands of federal employees living here in the City of San Antonio, I feel that this very adequate and a very fair percentage salary increase. I also feel that every City employee should be given a pay increase and I speak as a tax payer. Even a 5.5 I am very much aware does not keep up with our increase of utilities, they go up and up and up, but it helps. To give us more, to give anyone more creates such a burden upon the tax payers of this City that I feel that this is a fair and just salary increase and I would like to speak in favor of it. It is said that collective bargaining is like opening Pandora's box. It creates a said situation and it makes one question the value of collective bargaining in view of what has happened here.

I would also like to just very briefly say there are some of you who are aware of the situation of the Greater San Antonio Youth Symphony. It has come about in recent months and we are working very hard on it and I will be back to ask for a budget consideration upon this group. They are a very worthwhile, very deserving group of young people of this City and our plans are shaping up into a very exciting projection such as working the Cinema House in downtown San Antonio, where all the children of this City can come and involve themselves in music on the weekends instead of involving themselves in other questionable activities. I will be back. Do remember to

consider us when you are giving out your money because we need it desperately and we will make a formal presentation at a little later date and thank you very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. All right, are there any other citizens who were not registered who wish to speak? Then the Chair declares the budget hearing closed. There is at least one item that the Council wishes to consider in Executive Session and so there will be no formal action on this until a personnel item relative to the budget is considered in Executive Session.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Do you want to further discuss the remainder of the Arts before you close the hearing?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, the Council had received the report of the committee and I think if there are any motions or amendments perhaps they will be held at the time we have the motion on the floor for the adoption of the budget. I know that there is at least one amendment relative to the Arts area. The report of the committee was that the San Antonio Symphony, the Zoological Society and the Witte each receive a 10 percent increase in last year's budget, that the Arts Council as the coordinating group for the City which was funded through a Revenue Sharing Fund this year be put into the General Fund budget at \$25,000, that the Ballet Society as we have reported be funded in the General Fund budget at \$50,000. That report came in in the form of the report from the Council committee.

Now after that report was received there had been about four other requests that have been sent to the City in the Arts field and I know that there is at least one of them that will be offered in the form of a motion and we would be happy to entertain that. I think possibly you might like to just lay out your concern, Mr. Rohde, and then we will consider it as an amendment at the time the motion is made.

MR. AL ROHDE: Mayor, could I make this suggestion that in view of the time that the Ordinance be read and that we make amendments to it and before the final vote if the amendment does not take care of a problem, that we are talking about, that we do go into Executive Session before the final vote. An amendment may take care of the problem that you are concerned about for an Executive Session meeting.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Oh, don't you think it would be better to have the Executive Session meeting to consider it?

MR. ROHDE: Well, it ought to be done now then, maybe.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well All right, what is your pleasure as to when you would like to have the Executive Session? Would you like to have it now? And then All right, fine so we can get the budget wrapped up. All right, fine, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: There is a question I would like to ask the Manager and also I would like to make a statement on the budget if I may. Mr. Granata, you mention that the 8.8 increase that police were given, the additional funds came out of the Police Department's budget.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct, sir.

MR. PYNDUS: And you said that this increase was available through attrition in the work force.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct, sir.

MR. PYNDUS: And we have in several areas of the City a shortage of police patrols and I am wondering if you can explain attrition in the work force to me.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Well, the way they came off, the new budget had proposed 50 new policemen. Twenty-five would have come on board on January 1, which would have not actually been any help in the field and the other 25 on May 1, which they would not have completed and wouldn't been full policemen until next year's budget. Then they are going to have to, there is about 17 or 20, I don't remember now, that will retire, they will not be replaced and the Police Association through efficiencies and other means feel that they will be able to cover the City just as well as they have with that small cut of approximately 17 policemen from the current fiscal year. In other words, 50 that were coming aboard would not have become available until the next year's budget as actual patrolmen.

MR. PYNDUS: All right, the comments that I would like to make with reference to the noncollective bargaining rights the taxpayer has. To me, I have stated over and over again and I know it's getting old hat, but this is a record year for San Antonio. \$136,000,000 and it provides adequate services as your statement reads. Last year you provided adequate services at \$124,000,000 and the average tax paying citizen would like to know when will this stop? I think it should be the concern of every Council member, the money management that this Council should give you the direction as to amount of money you will have to put in forthcoming budgets. And to have a spiraling increase without control, I do not think is good money management.

My second point that I would like to point out, I'm not very proud of the fact that we have discriminated against those employees that work for the City that do not have collective bargaining rights. I think that to give one group of employees a greater percentage of increase because they do have collective bargaining rights over that group that does not have these same privileges is not just and it's not fair treatment. I think that this practice - we should come to grips with this practice next budget so that we will not carry on this type of discrimination and that's what it is.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: I agree with you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Any other comments, Reverend Black.

REV. BLACK: Madam Mayor, I would like to just put into the record a concern that I have. For many years there has been a vacuum in the area of health in the East section of the City. I'm aware that this Council along with other Councils has sought to address that vacuum by providing additional clinics for the area and I'm greatly appreciative of that. But I'm still aware that infant death rates in that section still exceeds that of the total City. Now I discussed this matter with the former head of our Metropolitan Health Program inasmuch as we reviewed the budget. I was not able to find in his management procedure a resolution that would address or resources that will address this problem.

Now I would certainly like under the new management as we placed it in the record that we might be able through the Council to begin to address equity in the area of health services. Now, it seems to me that we do have an obligation. We have the medical resources. It's simply a matter of implementing the program and it's a lack of program personnel that I think is one of the problems that this matter continues to exist in our City and it has existed over the last 20 years.

I think there is a solution to it and that solution must be related to the resources of our City. But where there is no commitment in budget to deal with this problem then naturally we cannot expect any answers to the problem. I would just simply like to place it into the record that there is a concern on the part of this Councilman in reversing the trend now that exists in infant deaths in that area of the City that is established by our Planning Department. This has been established - it's not something that I've come up with but it's a matter of record in terms of our planning, and therefore, must be reflected in our policies that we project from the Council. So

I would appreciate it if this matter would be put on the record and that I might discuss it further with the new person who has this responsibility and we can begin now working on budgetary features that would, of course, deal with the problem directly. We've got the facility, I think we've got the know how, it's a matter of personnel being able to handle that problem.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. At this time, we will get - I was going to ask that we move into Executive Session but..... Mr. Teniente.

MR. RICHARD TENIENTE: I was going to comment on what Reverend Black has said because in addition to that particular concern, I do know that there are some clinics and some reorganization that definitely has to be reestablished as we get our new Director because of a lack of attention, lack of aggressiveness on the part of certain clinics and certain areas on the West side that I don't think are giving full service when they could be and yet the money is there and I don't think the money is being utilized properly. So if we go into this, I'd also like to bring this to the attention of the people that are working in this area.

To move onto one other item, I think that as we were moving into Executive Session, I would like to bring before the Council in the item in the budget that addresses itself to the Minority Contractors budget, a request since - request for the budget area - budgeted items showing an increase of \$31,000 which would bring it up to about what they have been working with. I'd like to present this to Council and I can anticipate some discussion on this as I'm speaking here because I know what's going to happen but I'm still pushing it and I'm still going to present it, okay.

DR. NIELSEN: I think we do need to consider that, Madam Mayor. In response to Claude's concern, he's right. A part of this may be ameliorated to administratively and it may take some budget additions as well, I'm not sure. We do have a report from that area. There's no question in the whole delivery system that the Public Health Service is operating and some of it depends to a certain extent on funds available from the State and I know we're all aware that those have been cut back and they may continue to be cut back. So we've got a dual problem both in terms of administration and of long and short range funding problems.

REV. BLACK: The main thing I'm concerned that we begin to address the problem. Now we've addressed it with facilities. But I think we need to address that problem in terms of how we can accommodate

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: A point of clarification, if I may, Mayor. Are you talking about an increase in budget? I didn't quite follow you.

REV. BLACK: I'm talking about an increase in life and if it takes a budget to increase life, that's what I want.

MR. PYNDUS: All right. How much dollars we talking about to increase life?

REV. BLACK: This I would look to the professionals for guidance in. The only thing I'm simply saying is that problem has not been addressed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: You're not asking for any change today.

REV. BLACK: I'm not asking for any change in the budget now. It's a matter that I would like to take up and I want it in the record to take it up with the new management.

MR. PYNDUS: How about the request from the United Organizations?

MR. TENIENTE: Mine is for \$31,000.

MR. PYNDUS: Increasing the budget?

MR. TENIENTE: Not necessarily in the budget but just a re-direction of funds.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. At this time we're going to go into Executive Session across the hall on a personnel item that is related to a budget item. Yes, we will try to come back and get the budget

The meeting recessed at 11:35 A. M. The Council went into Executive Session and reconvened in Regular Session at 12:00 Noon. The meeting continued.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May we have a motion for adoption of the budget and then we will consider any amendments thereto.

DR. CISNEROS: I move for adoption of the ordinance.

MR. HARTMAN: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded that the budget be adopted. Are there any motions or amendments to the budget?

DR. CISNEROS: I would like to impose on the Council's time just a very few minutes to raise a question which I tried to raise before and have gotten very good acceptance from the Council in general principle. That is the whole issue of building into the budget process some advance look at future budgets, future expenditures, revenues, and so forth. There was a kind of Council concensus before that we ought to work on it so I have done a little work on it and would like to make a very brief presentation here if the Council thinks that would be appropriate. I would like to add as an amendment that we embark on this kind of a procedure in future years. Would that be appropriate, Madam Mayor?

MAYOR COCKRELL: I think it would not be specifically, I think it would be more of an extra vote rather than one on the ... (inaudible).....

DR. CISNEROS: I'll be happy to wait till the end of the

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I have

DR. CISNEROS: I would like to make another motion though, and that is as the budget ordinance reads now, there are several sections of the Ordinance which might be more appropriately considered since they are slightly different in character and I would like to move that Sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Ordinance be deferred until next week until we have, that would be more in accordance with practice in past years.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Have a separate ordinance?

DR. CISNEROS: Have a separate ordinance.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion is that Sections 5, 6, and 7 of the proposed budget Ordinance which relate to salaries of certain employees who are employed directly by the City Council and not under the overall classified under the Management function be deleted and that they be handled in a separate Ordinance next week.

MR. HARTMAN: I'll second that. A question of point of order here inasmuch as the original motion was made by the mover of the amendment, is that in accordance with proper parliamentary procedure?

MAYOR COCKRELL: The Chair will rule it so.

MR. HARTMAN: Okay.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If anyone knows differently - all right, so this is an amendment, a proposed amendment to delete Sections 5, 6, and 7 from the budget Ordinance. Is there discussion on this motion? That they will be presented in a separate ordinance next week. Any further discussion?

DR. NIELSEN: Do we need a clarification also, Madam Mayor, on a couple of line items?

MR. ROHDE: We might as well take them one at a time so we don't get lost.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We'll do it separately and then you will still have the, yes, fine, all right. It has been moved and seconded that Sections 5, 6, and 7 be deleted from the budget Ordinance and be handled in a separate ordinance next week.

On the following roll call vote the motion by Cisneros was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Black, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell, Hartman, Cisneros; NAYS: Billa; ABSENT: Teniente.

MR. PYNDUS: Will you add my notes to that please?

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Yes, now we consider any specific additions or corrections or motions for the budget. Yes sir.

MR. HARTMAN: Excuse me. Madam Mayor, this is a point of clarification. Did we just vote on the amendment or did we

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, we voted on the specific amendment which deleted from the budget Ordinance

MR. HARTMAN: The original motion was to delete those three sections.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That was the amendment. Now what is pending is the basic motion on the adoption of the budget. We are back to that and will consider other amendments in the form of line items, changes or whatever. All right, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: If we were voting only on the amendment, change my vote to yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, with that correction, we now recognize Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Thank you. Madam Mayor and Council, my amendment is a budget item amendment that I wish to propose to the Council and I wish to read a statement on it because it is sort of detailed.

I request that Council support a budget amendment that I will make today which will insure that those with the least income are treated fairly in our City family of some 6900 full time and part time employees.

I understand the average City employee income is \$7,000.00. A 5.5 cost of living pay hike will give such City employees about \$33 extra per month.

A flat \$50 cost of living pay hike that I would propose would go to all City employees that are full time from janitor to the judges, department heads, and City Manager.

This would in effect make an equal cost of living adjustment to each and every City employee that's not under the collective bargaining rights to have a total take home pay hike of \$600 per year. I propose also that the 810 City employees who are part time during the summer and are on an hourly wage program would receive a 5.5 wage increase in their pay checks from this motion because of the involvement of the flat \$50 per month. This would work it out very easily for the City's Finance Director.

A breakdown of this proposed \$50 a month cost of living hike would increase the proposed salary increases in the budget from \$3.5 million to \$3.9 million. If approved, the City Manager would be requested to shift funds within the proposed \$136 million to provide for the additional \$414,000 that the City Finance Director informed me he would need to do this within the budget.

Council, it is true that traditionally City employees cost of living hikes in the past were granted on a percentage basis. This proposed plan which was just signed into Law by the State of California, the largest in the United States, by Governor Brown of the State of California was granted a flat \$70 for all State employees, the State Police receiving \$120. I feel that this pay proposal will provide a large one, time pay hike for the lowest paid employees in the time of high inflation. I want to emphasize to the lowest paid employees in time of high inflation.

I ask the Council's full support and cooperation in this major

July 22, 1976
msv

element of our legislative budget duties to affect the City budget for the fiscal year 1976-77. This proposed budget amendment will not, I repeat, will not change the present pay in salary classification of any present City employee. A copy of this memo is to be used by the City Clerk and City Manager as to the full intent and purpose of such a City budget amendment for fiscal year 1976-77. I am advised that this would cost an additional increase of \$414,000 and I wish I could get a second on this.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I will gladly second that motion because I believe what Mr. Rohde's motion recognizes here is the fact that we are dealing with cost of living increases and the cost of living hurts those most who have the least amount of salary. I think that by following this route that we are more accurately recognizing the difficulties that are posed by the increased cost of living. I think it more appropriately deals with the problems. I will second the motion. Subject to clarification, I would like to add that the \$50 per month would be within budget limitations that would be pertinent to a 5.5 percent increase.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion has been made and seconded that the Council, in lieu of a straight 5.5 percent increase across the board, grant a \$50 per month per employee wage hike. May I ask one thing? Were you including in the - was the intent of the motion to exclude the Police Department with whom we have already granted.....

MR. ROHDE: Yes madam, they and the Fire Department, they were already excluded and then the pay had been considered Madam Mayor, out of that. Anybody with collective bargaining was out. Also this does not include people like the Water Department, the Transit Department, which are under other jurisdictions.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I see. Is there

MR. ROHDE: This is for employees that are not covered by collective bargaining.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, then we will ask for a discussion on the motion.

MR. TENIENTE: Yes. Madam Mayor, in the third paragraph of this memo that Councilman Rohde has placed before us, he is saying that this would go to all City employees from janitor to City Judges, and then department heads and City Manager and we have just talked about excluding these City Judges and City Manager on another

MR. ROHDE: This would apply to them, whatever it is.

MR. TENIENTE: It may or may not, it is the point that I am making. We don't know if they will have the same increase or not. So I thought I would just clarify that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, I have all along felt that the City Manager's recommendation that we have a 5.5 wage increase was a good one and that it would, you know, equitably deal or at least provide some measure of relief across the board. But, Mr. Rohde makes a very, very good case for this kind of across the board increase for an absolute amount which has a greater impact. It's more equitable in the effect that it amounts to a progressive increase. Now I have talked to the City Manager about it yesterday and he indicated that he thought there might be some difficulty in terms of what it would do to the differential between wages and so forth, differential between scales. I have looked at that and frankly, personally, don't feel that would be a major problem.

I think that what Mr. Rohde is doing is to provide some absolute dollars and that really deals with the realities of cost of living. In other words, if we give a 5.5 across the board a 5.5 to a person making \$20,000 is \$1,100 a year. A 5.5 to a person making \$10,000 is \$550 a year. Now, how have things, bread, milk, utilities gone up so much more for a person making \$20,000 a year that he ought to get twice as much

July 22, 1976

msv

money - absolute dollars. What we are really talking about here is absolute dollars. I think it makes sense to give the absolute dollar figure across the board with the result that that person at the lower end of the scale gets a larger percentage increase than that person at the higher end of the scale. The affect of it is that they get absolute dollars which they can translate into payment of utility bills or payment on food bills or anything else which has gone up by absolute dollar roughly the same for everyone.

Now, one final point, if I may, I have kind of computed something here and I have problems with Mr. Rohde's amendment with one respect. That is that he means an additional fund requirement of \$414,000. I don't think we can just tell the City Manager we are going to pass this, now you come up with the money. That is not right, it's not responsible in our position as policy makers.

CITY MANAGER: I'll speak to that. I don't have it but I can tell you how we might do it.

DR. CISNEROS: I think what we ought to do is take the money we would spend by giving a 5.5 percent increase which comes to \$1,878,000 and divide by the number of employees and come up with what that absolute figure would be. I figure it comes up to something, somewhere between about \$42.00 or something like that. We would provide some equity by providing that kind of a figure not exceeding the 5.5 limit that we have given before. I figure this, Mayor, to a garbage worker, the man who is making in the \$7,000 or \$8,000 category, a \$42 absolute comes out to somewhere around eight percent. Now it's going to be a heck of a lot less than that to a person who is making \$20,000. It's going to be somewhere between three and four per cent. But the point is that the costs have not gone up that much more to the man making twenty that he ought to be justified getting twice as much money as the man making eight or nine thousand dollars. Yes, he has a higher standard of living but that's his problem. His standard of living is his problem. That's just the way I feel about it. I think it's fair, I think it's equitable. I think it's something we ought to do.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me ask this. I think we need to have - since this is a totally different approach to pay raises than we have ever had before, I think we do need to have the input of the City staff in it and I think the Personnel Director and his staff ought to comment on it.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, we may have to change the entire figures in all of the budget if I am correct. According to Mr. White we'll have to do that. For example, what it amounts to a department head under this plan would get a 1.9 per cent increase and, of course, your newly hired laborer would get about an 11.2 percent increase. Your labor foreman will get 10 percent, clerk typist 11 percent, a park ranger 7.8. These are just examples. The chief construction inspector 5.9, an attorney 4.8, a deputy tax assessor 4.1, a controller 3.6, a chief trial attorney 2.5. But we have to change everything.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, my second to Mr. Rohde's motion was with the understanding that the increase would be confined to that amount that would be equivalent to a 5.5 percent increase.

MR. RHODE: I'll accept that amendment.

MR. HARTMAN: So, I think the point that Dr. Cisneros raises is therefore dealt with if that second provision is accepted. Again, I think we need to emphasize we are talking here in terms of a cost of living increase, not a salary raise or promotion. It's important to recall that we are dealing here strictly with the fact that the economy has expanded "x" percentage since the last raise and that's what everybody is talking about. We're not talking about raises as such but cost of living, compensating increases. I think, therefore, it is an equitable way of dealing with it. I recognize that fact that if you look at the salary scale that it deals with different levels of salary in a different percentage, but I think that's the way the cost of living also affects people of different pay levels.

DR. NIELSEN: I appreciate very much your memo, Al. If we're still talking about cost of living and not just a fixed dollar amount, there is a way if we're serious about some slight inversion still using a basic cost of living which I have not heard anybody disagree with. How do we distribute that? I know it's a lot of work for Clyde and it would take some overall readjustments within \$112 million. It can be done, it's been done, not in the City, but it's been done elsewhere in the City of San Antonio. My recommendation, Mayor, to the Council is that because of the uncertainty of the State Supreme Court and how that might affect through the school suit and everything, the dollars available to this City Council during this fiscal year and realizing, of course, that in any way we can if there's any funds either through the Attorney General or whoever it is resolving the question of the exemption for disabled veterans on the tax situation and any monies realized there or any other increases in the budget that we ought to start where we are at the 5.5 right now and as soon as we get any clear indications that there is additional monies available, I would recommend, Al, that we put them available to the employees in terms of insurance benefits. Put that amount of money in the insurance program. I think that's where lots of low and middle income families within the City, especially those working with the City are probably most seriously crippled. I would recommend that we do that first and, secondly that in February we would have a lot better picture of what income we had where the outcome of the suit possibly that the Supreme Court is going to hear will be resolved one way or the other and we'll have a much clearer picture of where we stand fiscally because I don't think even you or any of us are about to deny our fiscal responsibility to all the citizens of San Antonio. That's my recommendation, Madam Mayor.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: May I - one reminder to the Council with all of these suggestions that this budget is predicated on receiving \$37,322,000 from the City Public Service, provided you grant the tax increase. So, February looks pretty bleak unless you do that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Provided we grant what?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: The 6.6, I mean.

MR. BILLA: He said tax but he meant rate

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me repeat, the present budget as you are proposing it does not include a recommendation for a tax rate increase.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No, no.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay, I just want to be sure.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: But in our projected figures that we are to receive from City Public Service Board they had included giving us our 14 percent as if you had granted them their 6.6 rate increase request. Eleven percent.

MAYOR COCKRELL: How much total does that make different?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: I don't have that amount right now. I don't know.

MR. PYNDUS: I'm still not clear if this motion is passed what the dollar difference is and what you have in the budget right now.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If I understand, the maker of the motion accepted the amendment which would be that the 5.5 percent amount be the total and that it instead be allocated on a per capita person basis.

MR. PYNDUS: I would then speak against the motion. Prior to our collective bargaining procedure, I asked this Council whether or not the salary increases as placed in the budget, 5.5, whether we would question that figure, amend it or increase it. This Council took no action on it. However, this Council has now taken action on collective bargaining in

July 22, 1976

msv

two areas. More than the 5.5 and that has been established and the police and the fire collective bargain areas, they have been allowed a greater increase than what you are proposing right now.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You've also authorized 5.5 to the Transit already.

MR. PYNDUS: This is an inconsistency that, to me, is just too late. I think I would support this previously, but now that you have allowed other people to go on a percentage basis and now you want to change this for the different type of employee, I don't think the consistency is there.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, let me answer Mr. Pyndus.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mr. Pyndus, for two years now I find that City budget making by Council is like wrapping a tar baby. You can never get your hands on it until you come in here and vote on it and that's my problem with this budget. You and I have had the label now of son of cut and trim in this City budget. We've watched the processing and whatnot and do you think I'm happy about it? But I know this that when they bring these matters to the Council this is where the votes are going to be and this is the most important thing. I raised this question in collective bargaining that I would probably make this motion. I said around \$57, so it comes as no surprise, and this is a conscience vote to me. I went home last night after CPS and wrote this memo because I said after talking with the City Manager after talking with Mr. Clyde McCollough they're not in favor of it. But Mister, we're the labor bosses of this City, we're the elected officials and we've got to be concerned about these citizens. You and I make payrolls. We know that you can't put this into an annuity like Councilman Ford Nielsen wants to do. They've got to buy shoes, they've got to buy bread at H.E.B. and things like this and when they get that cost of living index, that's what counts. That's what I'm looking at. The little guy in this City needs this cost of living and this is fair and equitable. It was approved by one of the largest states and went through a legislature that's tough. But they said let's try it and they did and it passed and it's now law. Let us set an example in one of the tenth largest cities and go on this. I urge this Council to support this amendment.

REVEREND BLACK: Madam Mayor, I think while this matter brings about some equity in terms in the amount of increase, if you're going to use the same set of facts or reasoning, then you would go back and take a look at everybody's salary that is different, you see, that is also at different levels. So, I don't know if \$50 answers the low man or whether \$50 answers the - or how it answers because all of them have different differentials in the total salary structure.

Now, it seems to me that one of the basis for the kind of approach that we have had is in terms of responsibility, also in terms of encouragement for aggressive activity on the part of those persons who do occupy and take hold of different positions at different levels. While I believe it's right to treat everybody right, I'm not too sure that to treat everybody the same is right. I think they are different.

MR. ROHDE: We're talking about cost of living, Reverend Black.

REVEREND BLACK: So, I like to treat everybody right, but it's not necessarily right to treat everybody the same. It's different because there are different situations involved in the whole matter. So, I would certainly tend to hesitate to, certainly pass this resolution now on the basis of all the implications I think it has far more implications than simply giving everybody \$50.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Billa and then I'll come back to you, Mr. Rohde.

MR. BILLA: That's the problem I have. I agree with the concept of trying to help that person at the lowest echelon, but if inflation continues as it has we're going to have this very same problem next year.

because these same people will be in this same low echelon again. What we're really saying when we do this is eventually we're going to be paying everybody the same salary for doing different jobs. I don't care what you say. It's going to eventually come to this if we follow this concept.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we'll go to Mr. Rohde again and then I'm going to call on the City staff to make their comments about the pay plan.

MR. ROHDE: Reverend Black, I'm very concerned about what you said because there is an equity. We're talking about two things. We're not talking about salary increase, we're talking about cost of living. I want to contain that because it's different, but in my discussion with the senior staff yesterday, he said you ought to be working towards getting the inequities of salaries worked out more than this. I said, well, that's not a budget item at the moment. But he feels that the whole entire structure of the City salary classification should get a total review and I said I will agree with that. I said after the budget I will support this because I'm relating to your situation that some of them are inadequate, maybe some of them are overpaid. We don't know until we know. But we haven't had time to analyze this, but this is a cost of living index hike, it's not a salary increase or classification increase. It goes to everybody the same.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Hartman and then I would like to ask Mr. McCollough.

MR. HARTMAN: Reverend Black, I would accept your approach if, and this is a big if, if it could be stated categorically. But there is a proper amount of differential, you know, throughout the salary scale. Accepting the fact that that is in all probability not true, in fact I would say, is not true, then I think you can accept the fact that we are approaching this from the standpoint where the cost of living hurts most.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I'm going to call on Mr. McCollough at this time to comment.

MR. CLYDE MCCOLLOUGH: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Let me give you a little brief thumb nail sketch on how our pay plan is set up. We've got 48 different ranges, from range 1 through 48. There's a 5 percent differential between each range. Each range contains 7 steps, there's 5 percent differential between steps, there's 5 percent differential between range. If you start dealing with dollars instead of percentages you are going to ruin our pay plan.

MR. ROHDE: How do you figure that?

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask the Council members to address the chair. We are going to hear Mr. McCollough.

MR. MCCOLLOUGH: For example, Mr. Granata just read off the effect it would have. A Clerk Typist II would get an 11 percent, an 11.8 percent increase, where the Chief of Police would get a 1.2 percent or 1.9, whatever it is. It just destroys the internal relationships. We are placing a price on the job. We're not placing a price on the individual occupying that job. Now, our refuse collectors right now, the average wage of our refuse collector is \$719.61 per month. A 5.5 would increase that to \$759.18, which is about \$40, pretty close to what you suggested. Presently, our drivers, our refuse drivers, average wage is \$847.80, a 5.5 would increase that to \$894.42, which is fairly close to what you are recommending. But, if we're going, when the Department of Labor puts out that consumer price index or their cost of living report each month, they don't put it out in \$5.83. They put it out in four tenths of one percent or whatever. They deal in percentages. They don't deal in dollars.

MR. ROHDE: I would like to address the chair, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, then Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: What you just said then, how could you relate to the California pay plan?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I don't know anything about that.

MR. ROHDE: Well, I mean it's about the same, isn't it? Is that going down the tube?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I haven't seen that pay plan.

MR. ROHDE: What difference would it be?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I guess there is a way that you can do it. I'm not saying..

MR. ROHDE: You're talking about a salary increase. We're not talking about that. We're talking about cost of living index. You get the same as anyone else.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: So am I. The cost of living went up more than 5.5 this past year.

MR. ROHDE: No, it went up to about 5.6.

MR. HARTMAN: Clyde, I hear what you say and I think everybody would accept due to the fact that if this were done continuously without at some point in time re-shuffling salary structure, and I point out salary structure, then I think what you are saying I would accept that. It would eventually miscue the whole thing. But the point is though, I think it has to be, I think we need to recognize the fact that up to a certain amount of dollars of a person's income, those dollars deal with the basic necessities. But beyond that point that are dealing partly with the subsidy in an increasing amount of what is known is the standard of living. So, I think from the standpoint of equity in dealing with the rise of the cost of living, this idea strikes at the essence of that problem. In other words, it deals with that part of that salary that is most squeezed when the cost of living increases.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, yes, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. McCollough, what you say is correct in terms of the 5 per cent differential because between each step in the 48 steps in the pay plan, in terms of dollars, if for example, one step is \$750 a month, let's say and put \$50 on top of that, it's going to be \$800. The next step on the pay plan, let's say is \$800 and increase that \$50 and it goes to \$850. The differential between them is still going to be \$50. The percentage will have squeezed somewhat from the absolute dollar differential. I mean the whole pay plan is going to rise \$50. The dollar differential stays exactly the same. My guess is, the percentages, you know, the squeeze in percentages is not going to be that great at all, from a fraction of a percentage point.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: I would like to review that.

DR. CISNEROS: The question then becomes for the purposes of administrative efficiency or what we would like to call a pay plan that makes good numerical sense, are we going to fly in the face what seems to me an equity argument which is that costs haven't gone up any more for a department head in terms of bread, milk and basic items,

July 22, 1976
img

-27-

for a department head that has three kids and manages to have gotten the education to make a \$24,000 salary. Costs have not gone up any more for him for basic items than they have for the garbage collector who has three kids and has to buy the same items for the same three kids.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: We could debate it this way too, that same department head would pay more income tax which helps the people down the line also. One other point, if I may, let's follow with the police for example. You just granted 8.8 to all the policemen. Now, the Chief doesn't come under the collective bargaining. He will get 1.9. Only last week I had someone ask me I should raise the Chief to \$35,000 a year which was about \$4,000. Now, under this plan, he will get \$400.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, there is a motion pending, and the motion is to take the 5.5 proposed across the board and instead grant a \$50 per month, or not \$50, but...a portion amount per month per employee excluding the fire and police who are under the separate bargaining provision. Is there any further discussion?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: How about the Transit?

MR. ROHDE: Transit is not involved.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Transit, you've offered 5.5. That was your last offer.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, is there any further discussion? Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Yes Madam, question of clarification. In the pay scale for a number of employees, Mr. Granata or Mr. McCollough, how many people do you have under \$10,000 roughly working for the City that would be affected by this ordinance?

+ MR. MCCOLLOUGH: The average wage is...

MR. BILLA: About \$7,000?

MR. MCCOLLOUGH: It's more than that.

MR. PYNDUS: I'm trying to see what those under \$10,000 would get under the old proposal of 5.5.

MR. MCCOLLOUGH: Actually this \$42 a month raise is going to hurt some of the people that you are trying to help.

MR. PYNDUS: This is my question.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion is as you understand it and we will vote now on this amendment. Clerk will call the roll.

DR. NIELSEN: No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. BILLA: I'm going to vote yes because I don't think it's going to work and I want to prove that it won't work.

DR. CISNEROS: I think it's a fair method of dealing with the cost of living, I vote yes.

REVEREND BLACK: No.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes.

MR. ROHDE: Yes.

MR. TENIENTE: What is the count.

CITY CLERK: Four to four.

MR. TENIENTE: Yes.

CITY CLERK: The motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion has carried and the amendment has passed. I think it's poor planning.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Have they set an effective date?

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I wish to make another amendment.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, those employees who have already understood that they were getting a 5.5 increase, it will have to be completely readjusted and half of them will not get that much. All right, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I wish to amend the budget by adding the Southwest Craft Center on to this budget of \$25,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there a second to this motion?

DR. CISNEROS: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, it has been moved and seconded to add to the budget to the extent of \$25,000, an allocation for the Southwest Craft Center. I would like to state as background that I am going to have to vote against the motion and the reason is I do so with great reluctance because I am very enthusiastic about the Southwest Craft Center, but we have received, I would say, four or five at least additional requests from other art and crafts and cultural groups who did not get their requests in to be considered by the Council and the committee and I would feel that I would be unfair to the others if I select one for funding and failed to fund all of the others. This request came in this week and it did not come in in time to have been considered by the committee. I, just on that basis, I'm sorry, as much as I am for the Craft Center, I just don't feel I can vote for that one without then having a rehearing on all the other cultural projects.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: I'd like to make a comment regarding this. Al, I know you and Henry and who else was on the Arts Committee, the Mayor. Sometime last week or whenever it was, I may have been out of town, I know you had some sort of a meeting. I just want to say that there's only one recommendation that the committee has brought to the Council and that's relative to the \$25,000. I guess it's for the operating budget for the Arts Council. I am not in favor of that, not that I do

not support the Arts Council. I think it is not good planning or good policy for the City of San Antonio to be funding an independent agency in terms of its management operation. I would much rather see that kind of funding go into a City department which we discussed last year and somehow we just never could pull it off. I would suggest that in light of my own personal priorities, that we re-direct that \$25,000 from the Arts Council to the Southwest Craft Center.

MR. ROHDE: No, I do not accept that because I have great faith and hope in the Arts Council. I've seen the marvelous work that they have done and when I voted for it, I accepted it as a culture treasure collector or inventory as putting it all together and I think we've got to give it a little time of testing because they are making inroads to enhance the culture of this City. The Southwest Craft Center is an inner-city treasure and you could talk about it all day but when you go over there, it opens your eyes of what it does for our young citizens, not only to learn and touch culture and the arts and things of this sort. Mayor, I apologize for not bringing this up but when I went over there and saw their needs and so forth, I guess I'm an easy touch. I fell in love with the place and I see the good work that they're doing. I see the work that they're doing for the students on Saturday morning. Over 100 students, 30 times a week and they're all races. But here for the first time the inner-city we can bring culture together for our young citizens and to see the senior citizens work there and whatnot. We need to support and protect these things and I realize it's where you draw the line, but I'm not ready to throw the Arts Council out of the bathtub for the Southwest Craft Center.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion is that was seconded was that we add to the funding by adding \$25,000 for the Southwest Craft Center. Is there further discussion on the motion? Mr. Teniente.

MR. TENIENTE: I just wanted to say that I will support Councilman Rohde on this because when we come up with some revenue sharing funds in the next few months, I'm going to propose equally as important, no, not the Lanier pool, the Chicano Arts Film Commission which I have been in touch with for the last few days and I would likewise think that they would need funding from the City so that we can promote some films. I have been working with them in Pearsall and they just need some attention. I think that if we're going to try to support all the different groups, we certainly have to support this particular group and I will be bringing you more information on this.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There are four other groups who have asked for City funds. Are we going to consider all of them at least?

MR. TENIENTE: I'm just making my position on this particular issue. Each one has their pet project.

MAYOR COCKRELL: One additional ballet group, one additional theatre group, I've forgotten what, two more theatre groups.

MR. TENIENTE: There are more Chicanos than there are of these others, you know.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I would like to remind the City Council that you set a day to meet with the representatives of the art groups. We met with all of those who requested it. Following that meeting, this Council authorized having a committee to review the proposed budget. The Committee met and made its recommendations. Now, after both of those events happened, there have been four, five or six requests that have come in and I restate my position that while I support the Craft Center, I'm going to vote against this appropriation

because I don't think it's fair to fund one and simply close the door on all the others. So, I just don't feel it's consistent. Clerk will call the roll.

MR. BILLA: We do that all the time, Mayor, close the door on many...

MR. ROHDE: I'm going to keep my foot on the door for those other ones, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: This is on the amendment to add \$25,000 for the Southwest Craft Center.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. BILLA: Yes, and I hope Mr. Rohde supports the Mission Road School.

MAYOR COCKRELL: This is called you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours, okay. Next item.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

REVEREND BLACK: No.

MR. HARTMAN: No, inasmuch as I think it would not be consistent procedure.

MR. ROHDE: Yes.

MR. TENIENTE: Yes.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, but only because it is the Southwest Craft Center. The Mayor is right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, motion passed, is that correct? Okay, are there any further amendments to the budget?

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, I would move that in terms of the item on the Minority Contractors Consortium, it be increased \$31,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, there is a motion that the Minority Contractors contract be increased by \$31,000. Is there a second to the motion?

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded and that means you are requesting the City Manager to find some place to delete \$31,000 or are you taking it from contingency or what are you proposing?

MR. ROHDE: Let him handle it.

DR. NIELSEN: Make that decision.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, there is a motion and a second on the Minority Contractors. Is there discussion on that motion?

MR. PYNDUS: Evidently, discussion does very little, Mayor Cockrell.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I would like to say that I'm going to vote against this one. I feel that having it come up at the last minute without any prior briefing of the staff and briefing of the Council that it was coming up makes it very difficult to make a wise decision. I have previously had serious reservations about this program as to its effectiveness and its wise use of City dollars. I think every report we have had from our staff indicates a serious question about this particular agency and its effectiveness in using the taxpayer's dollars. I, therefore, would not be in a position whatever to increase its budget. In fact, I've been looking askance as to whether or not it should be continued. And so I really would discourage the Council from adding to this program at a time when their efficiency has been questioned.

RAUL RODRIGUEZ: Bravo, Madam Mayor, but you know these people.....

MR. TENIENTE: The Council and Mayor did receive some literature from these people and obviously the schedule has been quite busy and you have not had a chance to review it, Madam Mayor. But this was presented to your office. Each Councilman received this particular request and it is not one of these items coming out of left field.

DR. NIELSEN: That's true, Madam Mayor. I discussed this with the Manager months ago and then again very recently. That is correct, okay.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: The Department of Commerce has cut the funds off from the Minority Assistance Program, MAUC, thank you, and at the present time, some people are being investigated by the Grand Jury because of investigations made by the FBI. I think that to bring this matter up to this Council this morning is highly irregular and totally fiscally irresponsible.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Is there further discussion on the amendment?

REVEREND BLACK: Madam Mayor, I would like to give my reasons for supporting this if I may. I think there is a need for an agency that deals with those persons in the contract business who are in a minority because they do have problems that are significantly theirs. Now, an investigation by any agency does not of itself establish guilt. There are those of us who are aware of that in terms of the significant backgrounds, significant persons, and our own group who investigated maliciously. So, this does not, I think, it should not take away the right of this group to receive our support. I think we ought to weigh it. I think there are services that it renders that are really significant and for that reason, I am going to support it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Clerk will call the roll on the amendment.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. BILLA: Yes.

DR. CISNEROS: Abstain.

REVEREND BLACK: Yes.

MR. HARTMAN: I will note no on the basis that I have not seen adequate justification for the increase.

MR. ROHDE: Yes.

MR. TENIENTE: Yes

DR. NIELSEN: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No.

CITY CLERK: Motion carried.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Motion carried and now the City Manager is then directed to find, is it \$31,000?

DR. NIELSEN: As well as the \$25,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thirty-one thousand dollars plus the \$25,000, so that makes \$56,000 that the Manager is asked to try to find.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, well the \$25,000 is already in because we had made those adjustments. So, we're looking for \$31,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, are there any other additions or amendments on the budget?

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, I have a question. It may have been resolved when I stepped out for just a moment. Is this budget that we're discussing now include those arts recommendations, or is that coming up under a separate ordinance?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, we included all the arts groups.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That total is \$191,590 and including the Southwest Craft Center.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Now, we have pending the main motion on adoption of the City budget. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Is the Bicentennial still in there?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The Bicentennial was in the, was it in the revenue sharing?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's in revenue sharing for \$37,500.00.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's in the revenue sharing as a non-recurring item. All right, yes, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, I'd like to revive one thing. If things continue as they are, I revive this proposition that we limit the take to whatever the budget projects for that year for CPS. Well, you know, if we're projecting, we're going to get \$37,500,000.00, if we reach that plateau that we quit taking any money from them.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: I think that the point that Mr. Billa relates to there is a question with regard to how much from the CPS revenue we should take. I think it needs to be re-addressed. We do have the Utilities Commission coming in to next year's (inaudible) for September that has some impact on it. However, I think that it should perhaps be re-addressed from the standpoint of adequate return on investment as opposed to a five percentage and there has been some discussion with the staff of CPS...

MR. BILLA: I'm receptive to that except that I think it would prevent the City from, you know, being accused of maybe receiving a windfall and immediately finding a use for it rather than living within a budget that we propose.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, and I think we are all in concurrence on the point that it would be wise, particularly in view of the impending role of the Utility Commission to re-evaluate the whole matter of the income to the City from CPS. We will address that separately, but it's certainly pertinent to the budget. Any further discussion? Clerk will call the roll on the adoption of the budget.

DR. NIELSEN: Has it been moved and seconded?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, it was moved and seconded before we went...

MR. ROHDE: The answer is yes.

MR. TENIENTE: Absent.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, I'll vote yes on the overall budget but note particularly to those items on which I had voted no, but they are in the minority, so...

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. BILLA: Yes.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

REV. BLACK: Yes.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: The motion carried.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion carried and the budget is adopted. Yes, Dr. Cisneros?

DR. CISNEROS: Not wanting to take all the Council's time, but I do have a report that I want to make prior to getting off of the budget issue in general and it won't take me but two minutes. What I'd like to do today is submit a statement into the record so that I don't have to read the whole statement. We've talked on various occasions about the need for some kind of mechanism to look into the future on the budget. Something that is going to look at the impact of continued inflation, forecast on the side on the City's work force volume in terms of wages and benefits, particularly those uncontrollable accruing costs and so forth, trends in the tax base and anticipated taxing levels and a number of other problems that are on the horizon for cities. Questions related to handling of debts, handling of capital costs as distinct from operational costs.

I want to very quickly pass out a report here prepared by Texas Municipal League on policies before City government relative to some costs. You will note on the front page of that that it lists seven different items. The determination of the general level of which services are performed, relative emphasis which will be placed upon different revenue sources, the degree of capital improvements which can be financed from current revenues, pattern of current wages, deferred wages, cash fringe benefits, time off fringe benefits, characteristics of overall debt handling, the degree to which local government with various levels of expenditure and taxation in view of changes in the local economy and others.

Mayor, what I've worked on with in conjunction with Carl White, is a mechanism whereby the City would put in motion a task force of local finance experts working with an expert who would be able to stay with core staff basis and City staff. Terrell Blodgett, who previously worked on the zero base budgeting, and who will continue to work on the zero base budgeting concept for the City, has submitted a proposal to help work on such a task force. This is the report that was prepared in San Diego, called a six-year program of financial plan for the City of San Diego, and I'd like some measure of Council consensus to proceed in letting Carl White begin to devise the specifics of such a program, and some indication of what he thinks it would cost the City to have that kind of telescope into the future. I think it's something that will assist us in getting five-year forecasts on revenues, on expenditures and getting out front. To date, I've been doing it in a kind of independent effort. I'd like Council direction, if you will, for the staff in some more formal fashion so that we can get started and bring the Council something very soon.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, this certainly has my full support. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Madam Mayor, I think very closely associated with what Dr. Cisneros is talking about here is something that has been mentioned from time to time is actually into a programming, a programmed document that actually delineates the expenditures over a projected period of time. This happens to be Baltimore's development program which is a six-year capital improvements program. The City of Baltimore is roughly the same size as San Antonio and laid out in here specifically where they project dollars to be spent during this six-year period. This is only on capital improvements. I think we should also address the matter of O and M. I think it relates very closely to what Dr. Cisneros talked about. I think that this should also be dealt with in that realm of study.

DR. CISNEROS: It's very interesting. What it does, basically, is it takes different revenue sources and the same thing on expenditures. I think it would be helpful to us if, obviously, today's budget process has been a helter-skelter sort of procedure. I don't feel good about having to make some of the decisions we had to make today on the basis that we have and it's never going to be cleaned up. But the truth of the matter is that all of the decisions that we have made today are at the margins. Some of them are really basic questions. Our revenues and expenditures in the future still have to be dealt with and this procedure would help us deal with those basic issues.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Does it meet with the Council's consensus that we ask the City Manager and his staff to take these documents and use this approach and bring us a report about what is involved in developing such a program for our City. Fine. I wanted to get one thing clarified. Excuse me for having to ask this again. I just want to be sure it's in the minutes correctly and there's no misunderstanding. Did I understand in the motion on the \$50.00 or the apportionment, \$42.00 or whatever it is for employees, as it relates to the Transit workers, would you clarify that?

July 22, 1976
jrh

MR. ROHDE: It does not apply, Mayor, no.

MAYOR COCKRELL: They were exempted from it as well as the fire and police.

MR. ROHDE: That's correct. The City Water Board. Anybody we had an obligation to. They don't come under our jurisdiction.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, the Transit employees, their's was funded in the deficit funds for the City.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Your last offer to them was 5.5 percent across the board.

MR. ROHDE: Also, this memo applies to summer help. It stays at 5.5, so there's no problem with that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, thank you very much. We'll be recessed and probably until about 2:15...

76-34 The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:50 P. M., and reconvened at 2:45 P. M.

Toward the end of the Council Meeting the discussion of the budget resumed as follows:

MR. HARTMAN: Based on discussion with our legal counsel, I think that it would be appropriate for the Council to reconsider what was taken earlier today with regard to the proposed flat \$42.00 per month increase for all personnel. I would, therefore, move to table that particular action or to recall it inasmuch as I was on the prevailing side.

MAYOR COCKRELL: You would have to move reconsideration.

MR. HARTMAN: I do move for reconsideration.

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

MR. HARTMAN: ...of that action and it to be finalized then next week. We do have another week, so that would be my motion.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: The motion then is to reconsider...

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion is to reconsider...let me just say that first you would have to - at this point, you would have to, let me stop and think, the budget has now been adopted and the budget ordinance is the one that would have to be reconsidered. I don't know if there was anyone that voted in the negative on the budget document.

MR. PYNDUS: I voted no.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I think you would have to reconsider the budget document before you could reconsider a pending amendment thereto. Mr. Parker, I don't want to get into the worse snarl...

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You've got to undo everything you did and start over.

MR. HARTMAN: Okay, actually then it would be reconsideration of the budget ordinance and I would so move.

July 22, 1976
jrh

MAYOR COCKRELL: I'm recognizing Mr. Pyndus for the motion.

MR. ? : (inaudible)

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, that's not correct.

MR. PYNDUS: I wouldn't make the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I'm just trying to keep us from getting in a worse snarl than we are in. This is a motion to reconsider the vote by which the budget was adopted.

On the following roll call vote, the motion carried: AYES:
Pyndus, Cisneros, Billa, Rohde, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell;
NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We now have the budget open for reconsideration. Now, do you wish to postpone action for one week or what do you wish to do?

MR. HARTMAN: I wish to postpone.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, three of us won't be here. I won't be here myself. I wonder if we couldn't act on it now and dispose of it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Do you have any other...

DR. CISNEROS: I'll second the motion because we've got some legal advice, and I think there's some other substantive information we need to get from the Personnel Department relative to the impact of the decision that we indicated earlier this morning, at least the intent of what we wanted to do and make a decision next week on the amendment to give a flat increase. It does require some hard thinking and I think we need to see that option as against the 5.5 across the board percentage increase option and that would be the basis on which I support the action to reconsider next week. The reason being simply that I think the intent of this morning was very clear and that was to provide some measure of equity to those lower wage levels and certainly my intent has not changed. Simply some legal questions and some administrative questions that have been raised that demand some very careful consideration and I would like a week to look at the various options. That's why I would like to second the motion.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: I hate to be a spoilsport, but we have to adopt the budget by the 27th and next week is the 29th, on Thursday, unless you want a special meeting.

MR. BILLA: I think that we ought to act on the question now.

REV. BLACK: I would like to move for adoption of the budget ordinance.

MR. BILLA: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now, this is as it was revised with the amendments, with the \$42.00 a month, is that...

REV. BLACK: As it was presented.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Then you would need to move to reconsider also the amendment.

MR. BILLA: I thought we had done that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We moved to re-open the entire budget proceedings.

July 22, 1976

-37-

jrh

413

REV. BLACK: Well, then I move for...

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, you can't move it because you did not vote with the prevailing side. It needs to be someone who voted on the prevailing side. All right, Mr. Billa moves that we reconsider the amendment which was passed which changed the method of the pay raise that would be granted to the employees. Is there a second to his amendment?

MR. HARTMAN: I'll second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion for reconsideration of the amendment? Those in favor say aye, any opposed no.

AYES: Billa, Black, Cockrell, Cisneros, Pyndus, Rohde, Hartman, Nielsen.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Teniente.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion is carried. We now are voting to reconsider the amendment that was made to the budget. It was on changing the pay from the 5.5 percent to the flat across the board. This re-opens the question of the vote on the amendment. Now, then, the question is now re-opened. Mr. Parker, I don't want you to have a heart attack...

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: I am not sure what's going on...The only thing I was going to say is if I recall correctly, one item was added X number of dollars.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: \$31,000 was added for the contractor's consortium.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: There was another one also. Those should be in writing.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Just one because the...

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: (inaudible)

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It was already included. Mr. Rohde's was already included.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: It does not have to be typed. Just so it is legible in writing.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's already included in the budget.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's the matter of writing it in.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It was the minorities contractor's consortium. It goes from \$110.00 to \$141,000.00. You wanted to add \$31,000.00.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: (inaudible).

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Now, Carl, that brings up another point because we are going to take that much more out of the General Fund Capital Outlay and put it in Revenue Sharing. What does that take? We were going to get the additional \$31,000.00 out of Capital Outlay now. Instead of \$191.00 we go to add \$31,000.00 to it.

MR. CARL WHITE: I need to see the budget ordinance because it is going to change two numbers.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, that's right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we'll let Mr. White do that while we are, we can continue with our work on this other amendment. We now have pending the amendment.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Is Mac across the hall?

MAYOR COCKRELL: I think I saw him leaving.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Should it be \$222,190.00, Carl?

MR. CARL WHITE: It should be - I guess if we add \$31,000.00 it will be \$141,000.00.

(All talking at once).

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: All right now. You can go back now and vote on the original thing as prepared. Someone has got to include in the motion to delete Sections 5, 6, and 7.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, I would move for a deletion of Sections 5, 6, and 7.

DR. CISNEROS: There is a motion on the floor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, there is not a motion at the present time. We had re-opened the question and we had not then received a motion for, I beg your pardon. You are right, what is pending, is the amendment. Yes, we have voted to reconsider the amendment, it is now pending. And so, we can have discussion for whether or not we, what we have to do now, see, is to revote on the amendment.

DR. CISNEROS: Right, we have asked for some substandard discussion which we wanted to get from Mr. McCullough and I would like to make a point -

(Mr. Cisneros then showed a chart away from the microphones showing the effect of a 5.5 percent across the board increase as opposed to an absolute dollar amount across the board).

MR. HARTMAN: The point is though the numbers that are benefited are not really germane to the basic philosophy of equity which I think this accomplishes.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, only if you got a great number of persons let's just use the \$10,000.00 range, who benefits more at the 5.5 rationale if you will, as opposed to the across the board.

(Several people talking)

MR. HARTMAN: But still, though, from the standpoint of what this tries to do, the numbers don't make a bit of difference. I mean the total number of people is what I am saying. The philosophy is applied to each...

MAYOR COCKRELL: The Council does have to make a decision. I guess we have the problem of we are running out of time on the budget and just whatever you all want to do, but we now have pending the amendment. Yes.

DR. CISNEROS: Carl, would you say and indicate what other people have said to me. (Inaudible)

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I would say, we are really getting into some deep water because we are here trying to make up a new wage formula and we don't even have our Personnel Director. We are just sitting here, you know, shooting off the top of I don't know if Carl wants to make any comments.

MR. CARL WHITE: Very briefly. We exchanged budgets with 43 cities. In other words, we sent our budget to 43 cities and they sent their budgets to us. We've noticed in the last ten years the trend in this direction. That the principle or concept I don't want to differ with. The ones that have done it have done it on a percentage basis. In other words, there will be a percentage break of 5 to 10,000 salary will get 4 percent. And you know the higher you get the lesser the percentage it is. And those at the bottom may get 8 percent.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, along this same line and, in fact, which is called an inverse skew with regard to the rate. The federal government by the way, about six years ago, you know, after they had been laboring this for a long time did a very intensive study and found that the inverse skew was the only really fair way to deal with the cost of living. Now this does it more simplifiedly you know, but still the idea of the cost of living is not a flat percentage thing. That was the basic problem.

MR. WHITE: We've got some payroll problems with this.

MR. HARTMAN: I know. I realize that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I don't feel that it should be debated at this time. And I suggest that we put it back to the proper day the budget should be approved. Now don't we have a special meeting on a Wednesday or a Tuesday we have two special meetings.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No, sir. We tried as I - I think we tried to get one with Lo-Vaca but I don't think that was verified.

MR. PYNDUS: Then we have one with the representatives from the State Representatives Tuesday morning and that date is the 27th.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What is the final date again when the budget has to be adopted?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It must be adopted by July 27th.

MAYOR COCKRELL: By the 27th.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: On or before the 27th.

MAYOR COCKRELL: On or before July 27 - and the 27th is what - Tuesday? Okay and we do have a meeting set Tuesday for something else.

MR. PYNDUS: We could combine them Mayor because I do not think they could be

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, what I would like - let's go ahead with the 5 1/2 percent but I would like to give very precise direction, and, of course, we won't be here

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: But with the Council committee start moving in that direction and our Personnel Director.

DR. NIELSEN: That's no problem we talked about it last year.

MR. ROHDE: I second that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The motion is now that we go with the 5.5 this year but that we give instructions for the next programming of any consideration of increases to relate to this new type formula.

MR. ROHDE: I second it because I think we make an end to those problems.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. We have a motion and a second.

DR. CISNEROS: Excuse me, if I could only make one comment if I can on that. Again, no reflection on the City staff as I think City staff has done an excellent job in many, many areas but so often it's impossible to get any movement until threatened with something as drastic as what we did this morning. It was only when we took the action that Clyde was prepared then to give us the numbers on what it means and if we are in fact saying next year fine, I'll vote for that but let us make it perfectly clear that we are saying that.

MR. ROHDE: If you're going to come to this you better start getting on

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: They'll be told tomorrow morning at staff meeting.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay. Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, on that basis I think we ought to give them more precise instructions that we're seriously considering this approach.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The inverse percentage approach.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: If you could give us a break point.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we can't give the breaking point tonight but we'll just All right. The motion and the second. Okay. The motion and the second is that we approve the 5.5 percent today as recommended by the Manager and but that we also go on record as asking the staff to take a serious look and indicate great interest for the next budget consideration in an inverse proportional ratio for increase.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: But you want to delete Items - Sections 5, 6, and 7 and what - would you make the effective date August 15th so that we can get everything in order instead of August 1st.

MR. ROHDE: I didn't hear you Sam.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You want to delete 5, 6, and 7 - that's what comes back next week.

MR. ROHDE: That only - you're putting the money in today.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I don't understand what you're making about August 15th.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: In other words, the effective date of the increase would be effective August 15th.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Why?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Because of the - you need that for programming time.

MR. WHITE: Not if you go with 5.5. No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The 5.5 is already there.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Okay, fine. Then it's August 1st. It has to be August 1st because the work week begins at midnight on Sunday-12:01 midnight on Sunday.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, before we vote. This is the only thing we're changing now. Other than 5, 6, and 7 and the 5.5. I call for the question.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: Did we have a motion to delete 5, 6, and 7?

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion is - all right, friends. Everybody keep still except me. I'm going to restate the question. The motion was that we approve the 5.5 percent. That we delete the three items mentioned in the overall Ordinance and approve this as the budget for this year.

On the following roll call vote the motion carried: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell, Nielsen; ABSTAIN: Pyndus; ABSENT: Teniente; NAYS: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion carried. All right. Now then that cleared up that item and then we must reapprove then the entire budget. May we have a motion?

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, we're only talking about 5, 6, and 7 as being deleted. Okay.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes.

MR. BILLA: I move adoption of the budget.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We have a motion. Is there a second?

MR. HARTMAN: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded to approve the budget.

On the following roll call vote, the motion carrying with it adoption of the Ordinance, prevailed: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Pyndus; ABSENT: Teniente.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Motion carried.

MR. BILL FOX AND MR. JERRY DANIELS

Mr. Bill Fox showed a five minute film on Transcendental Meditation to the City Council. He also spoke on the benefits derived from this practice.

Mr. Jerry Daniels also spoke on the same subject.

MRS. DOROTHY ALLISON

Mrs. Dorothy Allison spoke to the Council about an automobile accident she was involved in. The police had refused permission for her husband to move the car and instead had to wait for a contract wrecker which costed her \$12.00. She said that the present ordinance should be changed to allow a person to call the wrecker company of his choice.

MR. MARTIN SADA

Mr. Martin Sada spoke to the Council urging them to pass a resolution regarding the injustice done in the recent Morales case.

Dr. Cisneros stated that there is no way that individual Council members could take any official action since this is strictly a state and federal matter.

MRS. HELEN R. WALTER

Mrs. Helen R. Walter spoke to the Council in regard to the serious drainage problem behind Windsor Park Mall. She said that there are cables in the ditch that could be very dangerous to children playing there. She asked for immediate investigation by a City inspector and stated that there is a need for a change in the drainage code.

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, said that the ditch does comply with City specifications. He will have someone check the cables.

MRS. DOROTHY BRYAN

Mrs. Dorothy Bryan, 7707 King Arthur, said that she lives adjacent to Windsor Park Mall. She said that the Windsor property has had five or six feet of fill put in so that her backyard is no longer private and asked that the matter be looked into.

Mr. Sueltenfuss said that as long as natural drainage is not affected the City has nothing to say about a person filling in his property. He did say that he would have his inspector check and see what the situation is.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ

Mrs. Maria Dominguez urged that the dog leash law be enforced. She said that all of the police put all of their attention on traffic enforcement.

MR. JOHN BUENTELLO

Mr. John Buentello, a member of COPS, expressed concern about getting construction started on Pleasanton Road. He thanked the Council for having a pedestrian light installed at the intersection of Roosevelt and March St.

Dr. Cisneros stated that he had checked with the State Highway Department and construction is scheduled for October.

MR. RICKY GREENE
MRS. RAY HOOD

Mr. Ricky Greene and Mrs. Ray Hood complained about Salado Creek in the area of Hub Street. They asked that the creek be cleaned up and that a park be built there to serve the Eastside neighborhood. They presented a petition in support of Item 7 on the agenda.

76-34 PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE APPLICATION OF MR. EDWARD WILK FOR A JUNKYARD OPERATION AT 2202 WEST MALONE STREET

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,912

PERMITTING ESTABLISHMENT OF A JUNK AND/OR
SALVAGE YARD AT 2202 WEST MALONE.

* * * *

Mr. George Vann, Director of Building and Zoning, described the area being considered. It is zoned "M" Heavy Industrial. It lies between two railroad tracks in the Kelly Field area. Mr. Vann said that the Planning Commission had instructed staff to make a land use study of this area and recommended that no junkyard recommendations, other than those already in process, be acted upon for six months. This application was made at least six months ago.

Ms. Virginia Zamora and Mrs. Beatrice Gallego both spoke in opposition. They asked that no more junkyards be permitted south of Commerce Street.

Mr. Jack Efron, Attorney for Mr. Wilk, pointed out already existing industrial zoning and the high industrial uses already there.

Mr. Wilk passed around a book of photographs showing how his business looks. He does not deal in old automobiles, but processes scrap metal which he purchases mostly from Kelly Field.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Billa, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote:
AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell;
NAYS: Rohde; ABSENT: Teniente.

76-34 MR. JOHN WARNER

Mrs. Vivian Hamlin, Chairperson of the Bicentennial Committee, introduced Mr. John Warner, Head of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration.

Mayor Cockrell presented Mr. Warner with a Proclamation naming him an Honorary Alcalde of La Villita and gave him also a Silver Medallion.

Mr. Warner thanked Mayor Cockrell for her recognition. He congratulated her for her leadership in this bicentennial year.

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Ms. Jane Macon, Assistant City Attorney, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,913

ESTABLISHING RULES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING CONDUCT OF THE PUBLIC AT THE AIRPORTS AND FOR THE PROTECTION OF PERSONS AND PROPERTY THEREAT BY REPEALING SECTION 4-104 AND PROVIDING A NEW PROVISION CONCERNING CONDUCT AT THE AIRPORT AND REQUIRING A PERMIT AND PRESCRIBING PENALTIES.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Tom Raffety, Director of Aviation, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,914

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT WITH JOHN BURKE D/B/A BURKE AVIATION TO EXTEND THE PRESENT LEASE AGREEMENT AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FOR A ONE (1) YEAR PERIOD.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,915

CANCELLING FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION LEASE NO. DOT-FA76SW-1018 FOR THE LEASE OF SPACE IN THE ANNEX TERMINAL BUILDING AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,916

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION LEASE NO. DOT-FA72SW-1045 FOR THE LEASE OF SPACE AT STINSON AIRPORT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,917

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT NO. 2 TO LEASE NO. DOT-FA73SW-1256, FOR ADDITIONAL SPACE IN THE AIRPORT TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWER AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,918

MANIFESTING THE CONSENT OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TO THE SUBLEASE OF CERTAIN PREMISES AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FROM REBCO, INC. TO J. W. MILLER AVIATION, INC.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,919

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LICENSE AGREEMENT, DOT-FA-76SW-1274, GRANTING THE UNITED STATES THE RIGHT AND PRIVILEGE TO INSTALL, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN A TEMPORARY LEAD-IN LIGHT SYSTEM FOR RUNWAY 21 AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, AND DIRECTING SUBMISSION OF SAME TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,920

AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION TO THE TEXAS PARKS & WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT FOR A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION GRANT TO ASSIST IN ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR PARK USE AND CERTIFYING THAT THE CITY IS ELIGIBLE FOR SUCH ASSISTANCE.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,921

APPROPRIATING \$21,000 FROM 1970 PARK BOND FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE WILLOW SPRINGS GOLF COURSE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,922

ACCEPTING A .468 ACRE TRACT OF LAND FROM THE NORTHSIDE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT RELATIVE TO THE PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITY TO BE LOCATED NEAR ANSON JONES MIDDLE SCHOOL.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,923

ACKNOWLEDGING SAN ANTONIO GARDEN CENTER COMMITMENT TO FUND THE CREATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE GARDEN FOR THE BLIND, AN ELEMENT OF THE SAN ANTONIO BOTANICAL CENTER, ESTABLISHING A TRUST FUND FOR THIS PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE OF SUCH FUNDS UPON COMPLETION OF PLANS AND AWARDING OF A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR SAID PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,924

AUTHORIZING APPLICATION TO THE TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT FOR A PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY PROGRAM GRANT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF JOHN JAMES PARK.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John W. Rinehart, Operations Manager for Fiscal Planning and Control Division, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,925

AWARDING VARIOUS SUMS TO INNER CITY DEVELOPMENT, INC. (\$14,535), ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION (\$11,000), SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC. (\$10,468), UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY ASSN. (\$7,000) AND BICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE (\$37,500) FROM FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF PROJECTS AND NEEDS OF THE AGENCIES; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AGREEMENTS WITH THE AGENCIES FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE FUNDS; AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN BUDGETARY ACCOUNTS OF FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FIFTH ENTITLEMENT PERIOD FUNDS.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,926

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE OF \$85,000.00 FROM FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS TO PURCHASE METERS, CLEAN AND REPAIR THE CHILLED WATER SYSTEM AND REPAIR METER WELLS AT HEMISFAIR PLAZA, ESTABLISHING A FUND FOR THE PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING A REPROGRAMMING OF FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS TO FUND THE PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,927

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THE CITY WATER BOARD TO DESIGN, PROGRAM AND IMPLEMENT A COMPUTER ASSISTED DISPATCHING SYSTEM FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,928

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT WITH BEXAR COUNTY A JOINT APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION OF THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO CONTINUE THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING UNIT AND BEXAR METROPOLITAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1976 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1977.

* * * *

76-34 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,929

EXTENDING THE OPERATING PERIODS OF AGREEMENTS WITH THE SAN ANTONIO DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR OPERATING CERTAIN LOAN AND GRANT PROGRAMS AND OTHER PROJECTS IN THE SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - FIRST YEAR THROUGH COMPLETION OR TERMINATION BY ACT OF THE CITY OR THE AGENCY.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Cipriano Guerra, Director of Community Development, who said that this is to continue first year work on these Community Development Projects.

Mr. Pyndus said that progress made on the Housing Rehabilitation project has been questioned as to its effectiveness.

Mr. Guerra said that he has been following the project closely. The San Antonio Development Agency Board has asked for a meeting soon with the Council's Housing Subcommittee to review some additional changes. He recommended that this Ordinance be approved and the changes can be made later.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Bill Holtzinger, Assistant Director of Convention Facilities, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Billa, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Pyndus, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,930

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE
A BEVERAGE CONCESSION AGREEMENT WITH THE
ALAMO KIWANIS CLUB.

* * * *

76-34 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,931

CONTINUING THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF SAN ANTONIO RAPE CRISIS CENTER
AND SETTING FORTH ITS COMPOSITION,
FUNCTION AND DUTIES FOR THE GRANT YEAR
JUNE 1, 1976 THROUGH MAY 31, 1977.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Dr. Jill Root, Coordinator of the San Antonio Rape Crisis Center, who said that this Ordinance authorizes continuance of the Advisory Council to the Rape Crisis Center.

Mr. Raul Rodriguez said that this is a discriminatory ordinance. He spoke of men being raped by men in the County Jail. He said that a plan needs to be worked out so that civilian observers can be allowed in the jail to prevent these rapes.

Mayor Cockrell explained that the jail is under the jurisdiction of the County Commissioners and Mr. Rodriguez should discuss the matter with that body.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen.

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Dr. Jill Root, Coordinator of the San Antonio Rape Crisis Center, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Rohde, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,932

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE
AGREEMENTS FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES,
WHEREBY THE SAN ANTONIO RAPE CRISIS
CENTER-SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES AND
THE CONSULTANT SHALL PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL
TRAINING TO VOLUNTEERS TO IMPROVE SERVICES
AVAILABLE TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.

* * * *

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,933

ADOPTING A SCHEDULE OF HOLIDAYS FOR THE
1976-77 FISCAL YEAR.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Clyde McCollough, Jr., Director of Personnel, who said that this is the Ordinance adopted each year setting out holidays to be observed in the coming fiscal year. This year there are nine recommended holidays.

Dr. Cisneros said that some cities have optional holidays which employees may use to observe a religious holiday or birthday or some other special occasion and asked if this has been given consideration.

Mr. McCollough said that this is called a "designated" holiday and could be put into effect.

Mr. Rohde moved that the Ordinance be approved. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cisneros.

Rev. Black offered a substitute motion that a "designated" holiday be added making a total of ten holidays. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen and failed to carry on the following roll call vote: AYES: Cisneros, Black, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Pyndus, Rohde; ABSENT: Billa, Hartman, Teniente.

The original motion to approve the recommended Ordinance was passed and approved by the following roll call vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Hartman, Teniente.

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Hartman, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,934

PERMITTING ERECTION OF A FENCE EIGHT
FEET IN HEIGHT AT 12823 NACOGDOCHES
ROAD. (TO JERRY D. ALLEN)

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,935

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS
WITH VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES
UNDER WHICH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
WILL FURNISH RADIO MAINTENANCE FOR A
ONE-YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING AUGUST 1,
1976 AND ENDING JULY 31, 1977.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Director of R.O.W. and Land Acquisition, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,936

GRANTING A LICENSE TO KAISER CEMENT AND GYPSUM CORPORATION TO CONSTRUCT A VEHICULAR UNDERCROSSING UNDER SCHERTZ ROAD AND MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,937

CLOSING AND ABANDONING PORTION OF McCULLOUGH AVENUE AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$1.00.

* * * *

76-34 Mayor Cockrell was obliged to leave the meeting and Mayor Pro-Tem Rohde presided.

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Director of R.O.W. and Land Acquisition, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Billa, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,938

CLOSING AND ABANDONING TWO NARROW STRIPS OF LAND ADJACENT TO NEW CITY BLOCK 271 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A QUITCLAIM DEED OF THE SAME TO MORRIS ROSIN, FOR A CONSIDERATION OF \$150.00.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Director of R.O.W. and Land Acquisition, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,939

CLOSING AND ABANDONING A PORTION OF NACOGDOCHES ROAD AT ITS INTERSECTION WITH THOUSAND OAKS DRIVE AND PERRIN-BEITEL ROAD, AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO FEATHERCREST JOINT VENTURE II IN EXCHANGE FOR AND IN CONSIDERATION OF THE CONVEYANCE OF A STRIP OF LAND ALONG THOUSAND OAKS DRIVE FOR REALIGNMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE INTERSECTION, AND ACCEPTING A DEED THEREFOR.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,940

CLOSING AND ABANDONING AN ALLEY BETWEEN CAPITOL AVENUE AND THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD IN NEW CITY BLOCK 1776, AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO J. A. DOBBINS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$175.00, AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO MRS. THOMAS D. JONES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$175.00.

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Director of R.O.W. and Land Acquisition, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Billa, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,941

APPROPRIATING FROM CERTAIN FUNDS AMOUNTS IN THE TOTAL SUM OF \$2,512.50 IN PAYMENT FOR EXPENSES INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH 24TH STREET IMPROVEMENT; CUPPLES ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; STORM DRAINAGE PROJECT #39-G (WEIR AVENUE); HILDEBRAND DRAINAGE PROJECT #37; STORM DRAINAGE PROJECT #58-C (CULEBRA-MARTIN); MARTIN LUTHER KING STREET IMPROVEMENT (NEBRASKA STREET); COLISEUM ROAD PROJECT; CLOVIS STREET DRAINAGE #68-A; WAGNER STREET DRAINAGE; BAKER OIL TOOLS SUBDIVISION OFF-SITE MAIN (MISCELLANEOUS EASEMENTS AND DEDICATIONS); AND SKYLINE ESTATES SANITARY SEWER PROJECT (MISCELLANEOUS EASEMENTS AND DEDICATIONS).

* * * *

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,942

CLOSING AND ABANDONING PORTIONS OF NORTH LEONA STREET, W. SALINAS STREET, W. TRAVIS STREET AND TWO ALLEYS, AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO SAN ANTONIO DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$1.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,943

GRANTING A LICENSE TO SOUTHWEST TEXAS METHODIST HOSPITAL TO CONSTRUCT A TUNNEL UNDER MEDICAL DRIVE AND MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,944

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$3,590.00 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 46,945

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,756.00 TO THE CONTRACT WITH THE VERTEX CORPORATION FOR VIRGIL T. BLOSSOM PARK IMPROVEMENTS, PHASE I.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,946

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH R. MARVIN SHIPMAN & CO., CONSULTING ENGINEERS, TO PROVIDE ENGINEERING SERVICES AND TO PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SAN PEDRO HILLS UNIT 15 OFF-SITE SANITARY SEWER MAIN, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF THE SUM OF \$5,750.00.

* * * *

76-34 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Billa, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 76-34-55

GIVING NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING ON INCREASES IN SEWER RATES OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TO BE HELD IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, AT 10:00 A.M., AUGUST 12, 1976.

* * * *

SHADY OAKS SUBDIVISION
WOODS OF SHAVANO, UNIT 1

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, advised the Council of plats being processed for two subdivisions lying over the Edwards Recharge Zone. They were the Shady Oaks Subdivision and the Woods of Shavano, Unit 1. Both plats were referred to the Planning Commission for consideration.

76-34 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,947

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID TOTALLING \$332,700.00 FROM VERTEX CORPORATION TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS AT PALM HEIGHTS PARK AND AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH THE CONTRACTOR; AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF THE CONTRACT, ADDITIONAL ARCHITECT FEES AND CONTINGENT EXPENSES IN THE PROJECT FROM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - FIRST YEAR FUNDS AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET FOR SAID PROGRAM.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,948

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID TOTALLING \$91,880.00 FROM G. P. FALBO, INC., TO CONSTRUCT PHASE II OF THE UNSEWERED AREA 53 SANITARY SEWER PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH THE CONTRACTOR; AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF THE CONTRACT AND CONTINGENT EXPENSES IN THE PROJECT FROM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - FIRST YEAR FUNDS AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET FOR SAID PROGRAM.

* * * *

76-34 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Robert Fisher, Administrative Assistant, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 76-34-56

ENDORING THE PROPOSED BY-LAWS OF THE METROPOLITAN YOUTH AGENCY AND ESTABLISHING THE METROPOLITAN YOUTH AGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL.

* * * *

Councilman Cisneros asked for a Citation to honor Atlee B. and Robert Ayres who were the architects for some of San Antonio's outstanding buildings. The Clerk was asked to prepare a Citation which will be presented by Mayor Cockrell.

76-34 The meeting recessed at 5:45 P. M., to go into Executive Session. It reconvened at 6:55 P. M., to continue the budget discussion. See Page 36 of these minutes.

76-34 The Clerk read the following letter:
July 16, 1976

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

Madam and Gentlemen:

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

July 12, 1976

Petition submitted by Mr. James R. Stewart, 263 Country Lane, requesting permission to construct a tennis court on his property located at 223 Country Lane.

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

* * * *

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 P. M.

A P P R O V E D

Lela Cockrell

M A Y O R

ATTEST: *G. V. Jackson, Jr.*
C i t y C l e r k