

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ABILENE, TEXAS,
TO BE HELD IN THE POLICE TRAINING ROOM, CITY HALL, 555 WALNUT, ABILENE,
TEXAS, ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1982, AT 9:00 A.M.

WORK SESSION

AGENDA

- a. Organization Overview.
- b. Status Report on Street and Drainage Projects
Abilene Capital Improvement Program.
- c. Abilene Municipal Airport Master Plan - Update.
- d. Landfill - Update.
- e. One-Call Utility Location System - Explanation
and Update.
- f. Floodwater Management Study - Presentation of
Interim Report.
- g. Refuse Collection - Presentation of Side-loader
Program Survey Test Results.
- h. Public Hearing:
Consider on second and final reading - ordinance
setting West Texas Utility Rates.
- i. Consider acquisition of property for Transit
Maintenance Facility.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above notice of meeting was posted on the bulletin board at the City Hall of the City of Abilene, Texas, on the 1st day of February, 1982, at 9:00 a.m.


Assistant City Secretary

POLICE TRAINING ROOM
CITY HALL, THE CITY OF ABILENE, TEXAS.

The City Council of the City of Abilene, Texas, met in Special Workshop, Thursday, February 4, 1982, at 9:00 a.m. with Mayor Elbert E. Hall, present and presiding. Councilmen Seaton Higginbotham, Juan C. Rodriguez, A. E. Fogle, Jr., L. D. Hilton & Councilwoman Kathy Webster, present. Councilman Dick Bowen, absent. City Manager Ed Seegmiller, City Attorney Harvey Gargill & City Secretary Ruth Hodgkin, present.

Invocation by Councilman Fogle.

Mayor Hall called the meeting to order, and explained that we would be handling the West Texas Utilities Rate Case first on the agenda.

Mayor Hall asked Mr. Gargill to brief the Council on the rate request.

He said that the ordinance that was before them for approval, grew out of a meeting last Wednesday in Austin. The ordinance comes to the Council recommended by the U.S. States Air Force representative, by the Company, the Public Utility Staff and the Cities that participated in this case.

Mr. Gargill said that WTU's request was approximately \$32,000,000, and the settlement provides for a total increase of about \$17,000,000. Mr. Gargill said that residential customers electricity bills will go up about 9.77%. The company has said it will be about 10.2%. The original request was for a 15.4% increase, he said.

Mayor Hall opened public hearing on the ordinance, pertaining to the rate hike that West Texas Utilities Co. had requested.

Holman King, West Texas Utilities Vice President for corporate services, urged the Mayor and Council to pass the revised ordinance, and said that he would be glad to answer questions.

There being no one else present and desiring to be heard, Mayor Hall closed the public hearing.

After discussion, Councilman Hilton moved passage of the ordinance on second and final reading amending the rates to be charged West Texas Utilities customers. The motion was seconded by Councilman Higginbotham. The motion carried as follows:

AYES: Councilmen Higginbotham, Rodriguez, Fogle, Hilton, Councilwoman Webster & Mayor Hall.
NAYS: None.

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING RATE SCHEDULES TO BE CHARGED BY WEST TEXAS UTILITIES COMPANY IN THE CITY OF ABILENE, TEXAS, PROVIDING FOR SCHEDULES, CONDITIONS, SEVERABILITY; REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES.

FRANCHISE-
WEST TEXAS
UTILITY RATE
INCREASE-
FINAL RD.

Mr. Seegmiller said that we would be getting into the Flood Water Management Study. He said that we had asked the members of the Planning & Zoning Commission, members of the Technical Review Committee to attend the meeting. He said that we would be getting some of the preliminaries now, but on March 4, 1982, we would have a wrap up. He said that we needed to decide on what alternative to the flood problem, so that we could build the figure into the budget, to be carried out. He said that we would also be talking about administrative controls, and how they could be carried out.

FLOOD WATER
MANAGEMENT
STUDY

Mr. Seegmiller said that we needed some guidance in how we can control or keep from adding to the problem of flooding.

Bob Whitehead, Director of Public Works, presented the Flood Water Management Study and said that they would need some concurrence in the plans. He said that during the past 25 years, a number of studies have been completed which are concerned with the problem of flooding in the Abilene area. The Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and consultants for the City of Abilene have produced the studies in varying degrees of detail and with

different proposals for effecting an adequate and acceptable solution to the flood control problem.

Mr. Whitehead said that the basic studies, as they went into it about a year and one half ago, was to produce a flood water management plan.

Mr. Whitehead said that he appreciated everyone coming, especially the County Commissioners, because the study did involve some areas outside the City limits, as we put on some controls to the watersheds that affect Abilene. He showed some slides on just how the Staff plans to accomplish the goals.

He said that the goals were 1) Provide the City Council with a rational framework for choosing among alternative solutions those best suited to become policy for the development of each stream passing through Abilene. 2) Provide the City Council with several alternative solutions to flooding on each of the streams that can be evaluated on the basis of capital and maintenance costs and benefits including but not limited to:

- Channelization
- Concrete-lined
- Concrete bottom
- Earth
- Storm Sewer Systems
- Diversions
- Surface Drainage Systems
- On and Off-Site Retention
- Major Retention Structures
- Open Space for Flood Purposes
- Purchase
- Easements

3) Provide a physical plan for each creek, or stream, in the City which may be used to guide developers and City officials as they make development decisions on each stream. Alternative uses of flood control facilities such as recreational lakes, bicycle trails or multi-use facilities should also be identified. 4) Provide alternatives which will reduce or at least maintain the current limits of the flood-hazard area. 5) Provide the level of detail necessary to allow implementation of the preferred solutions on each stream. 6) Provide mechanisms which may be utilized by the City of Abilene to evaluate the impacts of new development upon the flood-hazard area and to evaluate the impacts of new development on the preferred solutions on each stream. 7) Be consistent with the City of Abilene's desire to continue participation in the Federal Flood Insurance Program. 8) Be cognizant of the City's need to choose solutions possessing characteristics which would make them potential candidates for funding by the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service and others, as applicable.

He presented the different plans (studies) and what their recommendation were. He said that they used these studies to help them make their recommendations and decisions. There has been construction on each watershed, changing them some, but they were still used on making the Staff's update.

Mr. Whitehead presented the potential Administrative Policies which are the following list which the City of Abilene may choose to adopt as part of a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program.

- (1) The release rate of stormwater from all developments shall not exceed the stormwater runoff from the area in its natural state for all intensities and durations of rainfall.
- (2) All developments must provide control measures applying to all aspects of proposed land disturbances and shall be in operation during all stages of the disturbance activity so as to minimize damages to property resulting from erosion and sedimentation.
- (3) Public services will not be extending to developments which do not conform with the provisions of the Stormwater Management Plan.
- (4) The design of permanent and temporary structural stormwater control systems should be an integral part of the overall development planning process and should consider opportunities within the open space and landscaped areas for the creation of such facilities.
- (5) Natural overland flows and open channels and swale routings should be the preferred assignments for major components of a drainage system.

(6) Enclosed components of the storm water runoff system must help manage stormwater, not just dispose of it.

Mr. Whitehead said they had developed a Computer Model to tell us what different types of storms produce in the way of water and how we can best deal with it. He said that the Computer Model would help us analyse what alternative would be best in each instance.

He said that they would use the Model to help give the Council a cost estimate in each of the alternatives.

He said that in March they would bring back the soft part of the package, as to administrative controls. He said this would include ordinances, engineering design manual, etc.

Mr. Seegmiller said that this would be the time when policies would need to be looked into, so far as flood management is concerned.

Mr. Whitehead said that some of the regulatory controls could be done thru Zoning Regulations. Another control that they would be looking at would be Subdivision Regulations. Soil erosion and sediment controls will be looked at. He said that the runoff ordinance would limit runoff to nothing greater than it would be under natural conditions. Some of the methods that the developer can use would be surface storage, areas designed to impound the water, roof top storage, underground storage, penetration storage.

Some non-regulatory controls could be like annexation of property that was in our watershed. Another would be purchase of land in the community. Acquiring of flood easements and right-of-ways is another way and the development of policies. If we do not control the growth to the south-upstream in some manner, it will have an impact on the present build up of the city, as far as adding to the flood potential.

He presented maps and alternatives methods of controlling flood water, explaining as he went, on how much each method would cost.

Mayor Hall explained that he wanted the people to think about what administrative controls would involved, because it would be controlled growth, if necessary.

Mr. Whitehead showed an example which had been run thru the Computer Model on Buttonwillow. He said that the 100 yr flood would be increased greatly, if the runoff was not limited.

He said that it was a valid assumption that the City would control the runoff in any new development and he hoped that the Council concurred in that.

Mayor Hall asked Mr. Whitehead to show the Council what the Staff could do, by limiting the runoff to the present level and what the cost and effect would be.

Mr. Whitehead showed a table, Preliminary Economic Evaluation, showing the stream, Alternative No., Frequency Flood, Real Property Cost and Value Removed from Flood Plain.

He discussed a structural solution, going in and removing all structures and widen the channel, as one solution. The second basic alternative is what happens if we go in and put in some storage retention or detention and third thing would be a combination of the two.

He said that the above solution combination would be the best for upstream on Elm, & Little Elm.

Cedar Creek was discussed, and how to avoid another flood similar to the one in October. He recommends some channelization to allow the 100 yr flood to stay within that channel He discussed at length, the method of trying to avoid another damaging flood to the surrounding area. He said that the drop was about about .15%. He said that to do what is necessary in this channel, it would cost in the neighborhood of \$26,000,000, which is Alternate one. The value of the homes that would have to be removed out of the flood plain is roughly \$10,000,000.

He also discussed how the Cedar Creek could be modified, to take care of a 25 yr flood, and it would only cost around \$18,000,000.

He said that we approached a 100 yr flood in October on Cedar Creek, but on Elm, Little Elm & Catclaw, we only reached about the 25 yr flood.

In the detention concept of creating a pond, when it rains, this will slow the runoff and thereby help avoid flooding. It will just slow up the run off, but will eventually get to the lake. Alternative 2 is the one that the Staff recommends on Cedar and it would cost approximately \$13,000,000.

He explained several other alternatives on Cedar, but would recommend the above alternative 2 for the 100 yr flood, or 2A for the 25 yr flood at a estimated cost of \$11,000,000.

He discussed some improvements to Kirby Lake, so that it would be able to retain more water, and one that we looked at before by Lytle Creek above Lytle Lake, and two smaller ones on the upstream of Cedar Creek. This solution would cost about,000,000.

The last one on Cedar Creek, is a solution to avoid people getting flooded out. The City would purchase property which would be flooded, then let the water flow thru, after cleaning out the channels. This would cost about \$16,000,000. This would let the City have control of all the land, as it is developed. This is one that Mr. Whitehead would like for the City Council to look at.

Isolation of an area for 24 hours was of some concern to the Council, because of safety's sake.

Discussion of Elm & Little Elm, included what work that the City Staff has done on channelization. It needs to be twice as wide as it is now. It also includes a diversion channel to go over to Little Elm Creek, diverting some of the flow from Elm and improving Elm. Channels of up to 150' wide are needed. and channel clean out, some bridge replacement along Little Elm, out past the railroad track. This is the 100 yr solution, which would cost approximately \$40,000,000.

Under the same type of solution, but we could do the same thing on a smaller type. Improvements on Little Elm & Elm is being done now, but the channels are not large enough yet, but it does give some relief from flooding.

He explained that he was recommending some retention ponds be constructed on up stream. There would be 11 detention structures on Elm and clean out the creeks on the north side, there would be protection for a 25 yr flood. This is in comparison to October, since we think that was a 25 yr flood. Basically, with these structures in place, it would handle that storm like we had in October. It would not handle the 100 yr flood, but we could continue working toward it. It would cost approximately \$12,000,000. If it was done for a 100 yr flood it would cost about \$80,000,000 and would cover both Little Elm and Elm.

Mayor Hall said that we would continue this at the next workshop. He said that he appreciated the help from the Strategies for Responsible Growth and the Planning & Zoning Commission, because the Council will need help in deciding what to do.

Mr. Bailey Choate, citizen, said that the Street Department had been on his place doing channelization and straightening out turns in the creek, making curves. He said that they have done a good job, and it contained most of the water from the flood, because the channel was so wide. He said they could go no deeper in the channel because of the water level.

Mr. Whitehead said that he wanted to bring the idea of the Side Loader for Refuse Collection. He said that we have commercial and residential. He just wanted to discuss the residential aspect of Refuse Collection. He said there were three observations:

Manual versus machine
Side Loader versus front loader
Metal versus plastic

REFUSE COL-
LECTION STUDY
SIDE LOADER

He said that in order to achieve an improved refuse collection program, a side-loading collection truck was evaluated. Three thousand three hundred sixty-eight (3,368) residential households were placed on a mechanical side-loading collection test program for over a 60 day period. This test program was designed to answer two questions. Would the public accept such a system? Would this type of vehicle serve the overall collection effort better?

The public has accepted the system according to the answers on the survey post cards that were circulated.

According to the cost comparison to the manual collection and the front loader method, it has proved very satisfactory.

Mr. Whitehead said that one of the main reasons that they liked the side loading system, is the economics of it. Other advantages include better continuity of service; city supply and maintenance of containers. He said that most of the people like the system, once they are on it.

The complaints that have come in are that the containers are not large enough, difficult to use, alleys dirtier, bad placement and a problem with lids blowing off or staying open.

Chuck Smith, Refuse Collection Superintendent, said that the most common complaint was that they were not large enough. He said that he had surveyed where the complaints came from, to see if they need a larger container and he said that one location apparently did need a larger container. He said that he could work out this problem.

Councilman Higginbotham said that he was on the system, and that he likes it very much. He said that he feels that the other members of the Council and the Mayor need to be on the system, so that they will know first hand whether they want to vote for the system or not.

Jeff Grady, Administrative Asst., said that most of the cards came back in favor of the new system, with most of them having some comments that were favorable.

Mayor Hall left the meeting.

Councilman Hilton left the meeting.

Mr. Seegmiller said that it was more economical to operate and that it would save the city money. He said that the Staff was only trying to provide a more efficient, economical service, with fewer employees.

Councilman Fogle said that he felt that the older people should be given a special service, if the container was satisfactory for them.

Councilwoman Webster said that she had been told by citizens, that they would like to be on the new system.

Mayor Pro Tempore Higginbotham said that he hesitated to vote on the new system, with three absent.

Mayor Pro Tempore Higginbotham made the motion that the test program be continued, with the polyethylene barrels where the metal barrels are now, place the containers at the Mayor & Council's residences, where they would know firsthand, if they liked them or not. Then plan to make their decision on the plastic containers at the workshop on March 4, 1982. The motion was seconded by Councilman Rodriguez. The motion carried as follows:

AYES: Councilmen Rodriguez, Fogle, Councilwoman Webster & Mayor Higginbotham.

NAYS: None.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.


CITY SECRETARY


MAYOR ELBERT F. HALL