

MINUTES OF CALLED MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
LUFKIN, TEXAS, HELD ON THE
10th DAY OF APRIL 2000 AT 10:00 A. M.

On the 10th day of April 2000 the City Council of the City of Lufkin, Texas, convened in a regular meeting in the Council Chambers of City Hall with the following members thereof, to wit:

Louis Bronaugh	Mayor
Bob Bowman	Mayor pro tem
R. L. Kuykendall	Councilmember, Ward No. 1
Don Boyd	Councilmember, Ward No. 2
Lynn Torres	Councilmember, Ward No. 3
Jack Gorden, Jr.	Councilmember, Ward No. 5
Dennis Robertson	Councilmember, Ward No. 6
C. G. Maclin	City Manager
James Hager	Asst. City Manager/Finance
Atha Stokes Martin	City Secretary
Keith Wright	City Engineer
Kenneth Williams	Director of Public Work

Being present with the following business was transacted.

1. Meeting was opened with prayer by City Manager C. G. Maclin.

2. **STREET PROGRAM**

City Manager Maclin stated that a couple of meetings back staff presented to Council an exhaustive list of potential street improvement needs for the next five to ten years. Mr. Maclin stated that staff was somewhat overwhelmed with the total on that and realized that some alternate considerations and methods to help define priorities and to identify other potential solutions for funding were needed. Mr. Maclin stated that a preview of the PowerPoint presentation had been delivered to Councilmembers on Friday. Mr. Maclin stated that Keith Wright will talk about the street side and James Hager will talk about the financial side of the Street Program. Mr. Maclin stated that what he wanted to do today was give Council a starting point, something they can use as a tool to help make a decision to consider some ideas. Mr. Maclin stated that, certainly today, we will not be able to resolve all the needs for the streets in the City, but we do hope to identify a starting point and then provide some "food for thought" for the retreat that will be coming up in May, and some possible funding alternatives to be discussed, some of which are a year away from now.

Mr. Wright stated that basically staff wanted to start out with some definitions of things and how staff looks at them. Mr. Wright stated that the definitions are from the Subdivision Ordinance. The street types are: **Industrial** – a street located in and serving industrial property either existing or planned. Weber Street is an example of an industrial street. **Primary** – a street continuity, which serves or is intended to serve as a major traffic-way within the city. Most of the State highways in the City would come under this classification. Other streets that are on the City's truck route maps would also come under this classification. **Secondary** – a street of considerable continuity which serves or is intended to serve as the principal traffic-way between large and separated areas or districts and which is the main means of access to the primary street system. An example would be Copeland Street. **Minor** – a street supplementary to a secondary street and of limited continuity, which serves the local needs of a neighborhood. This is all the other streets that come off of Copeland.

In response to question by Councilmember Robertson, Mr. Maclin stated that in May the Council would have a presentation from TxDOT that will talk about the City's participation in two significant projects – the 59 South near term improvements which will widen US 59 from the Loop down to Brentwood and turn it into a controlled access freeway with feeder roads, plus Whitehouse improvements with a 20% match. Mr. Maclin stated that the City would have a 10% match that is required by State law for the property acquisition on the 59 South part. Mr. Maclin stated that these are issues that

will have to become part of the City's Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Maclin stated that anytime TxDOT will be doing major improvements that require right-of-way acquisition inside the City limits, the City has an obligation for 10% of the right-of-way cost by State law.

In response to question by Councilmember Robertson in regard to Raguet Street, Mr. Wright stated that the City's new maintenance agreement with TxDOT does require the City to spend some funds on keeping up landscaping, cleaning out ditches and drainage paths, etc., but doesn't have anything to do with the pavement. Mr. Maclin stated that Council would see a request for budget amendments to the Parks Department and Street Department to reflect those costs.

In response to question by Mayor Bronaugh, Mr. Wright stated that he has brought the intersection of Ellis and Bynum (which is a FM Road) to Cheryl Flood's attention at TxDOT.

Mr. Wright stated that the focus of the street improvements should be on those streets which provide the most mobility to the majority of the general public. Mr. Wright stated that the street improvements should focus on streets that facilitate movement from one or more geographic areas or neighborhoods to another. Street improvements should also focus on two types of street conditions: 1) That they are in fair condition but need maintenance in order to increase pavement life and prevent further deterioration, and 2) that they have major structural problems which normal maintenance procedures will not repair. Mr. Wright stated that street improvements should focus on primary, secondary and then minor streets in the order listed.

Mr. Wright stated that the street improvement options are maintenance and reconstruction. Maintenance includes crack sealing, overlays, chip seal, and slurry seal. Mr. Wright directed Council's attention to a picture of a pothole and alligator cracking. Mr. Wright stated that this is an example of a base failure underneath the pavement. The support structure that is holding the pavement up has failed. Reconstruction includes base repair, sub-grade stabilization, milling and new driving surface. Mr. Wright directed Council's attention to the second picture, which was a portion of Culverhouse Street that the City of Lufkin reconstructed through the normal Street Department budget.

Mr. Wright stated that the reason it costs so much to build a street in Lufkin is because of the expansive soil with a lot of clay content. Mr. Wright stated that when the soil has water introduced into it it expands and contracts, especially in a drought condition. Mr. Wright stated that the expansive soil underneath our streets is not being stabilized, and the City has allowed too many subdivisions without stabilization, thereby reducing their cost to develop, and it has cost the City that our streets are not in very good condition due to the lack of stabilization. Mr. Wright stated that stabilization builds a barrier that is not permeable and prevents water from getting to the base.

Mr. Wright stated that Council approved the purchase of a milling machine for the Street Department several years ago, which allows us to reclaim the asphalt. Mr. Wright stated that the City has a contract with East Texas Asphalt where the city reclaims the asphalt and sells it back to ETA. Mr. Wright stated that milling the asphalt allows us to get the drainage capacity back from the street itself. Mr. Wright stated that the milling machine was used on Culverhouse and also on Daniel McCall Drive.

Mr. Wright stated that other improvement considerations include drainage, street width and utilities. Mr. Wright stated that the picture on page 5 is of a base failure on Cain Street. Mr. Wright stated that there are several streets in the City of Lufkin with real deep ditches that are a hazard as far as the moving public is concerned. Mr. Wright stated that the Street Department is working on a project on North Street in North Lufkin where a section of the street has deep ditches on both sides of the street and is very narrow. Mr. Wright stated that the City's infrastructure and the conveyance of drainage has been one of the largest problems. Mr. Wright stated that a lot of the City's drainage problems are not the creeks but it is the water in the watershed trying to be conveyed to the creek that causes a lot of problems.

Mr. Wright stated that the Council recently approved a "drainage swat team". Mr. Wright stated that Mr. Poskey put together a list of every road crossing in the City of Lufkin and he will go out to every crossing, every culvert, every bridge that is crossing a roadway and make sure that the maintenance that needs to be done is done at those structures to insure that we are not causing a backup due to blockage in culverts and ditches. Mr. Wright stated that a lot of the City's culverts are undersized and that is one of the things that can be addressed through the street improvements to bring the size of the culverts up.

Mr. Wright stated that some of the City's streets are only 12' to 16' wide and need to be widened out. Mr. Wright stated that one of the problems is acquiring the right-of-way to widen the street.

Mr. Wright stated that a lot of areas have water and sewer lines underneath the street.

Mr. Wright stated that in the Capital Improvement Program in the 1999-2000 budget Council approved a list of streets that would be taken to the voters for voter approval. Mr. Wright stated that the total cost of the proposed primary and secondary streets is \$13,333,000. Mr. Wright stated that the MLK (Loop to the Water Plant), is a minor street, but needs to be included in the list for repair. Mr. Wright stated that City staff and local engineering firms put together a list of residential streets in need of improvement through reconstruction and maintenance. Mr. Wright stated that the reconstruction was recommended for those streets where the pavement was beyond its usefulness. The street will be completely rebuilt. Mr. Wright stated that the maintenance was in the form of overlays with some minor base repair on those streets whose lifespan could be extended.

Mr. Wright stated that the minor residential street costs including all six Wards came to a total of \$13,831,835.

Mr. Wright stated that staff recommendation to Council is that a Blue Ribbon Committee be selected to review and recommend a proposed street bond project, to include all the streets on the CIP. Mr. Wright stated that staff took the list to determine the critical streets to be included for voter approval and they were Whitehouse, Angelina, Lotus Lane, Abney and Hill. Mr. Wright stated that the priority residential streets include Culverhouse, Harbuck, Darlington, Daniel McCall Drive, Copeland, Allendale and Kiln. Mr. Wright stated that staff looked at each Ward and picked the worst streets from each Ward, and found quickly that there wasn't enough money. Mr. Wright stated that staff looked at the three streets where there were projects underway and they included Culverhouse, Daniel McCall and Copeland. Mr. Wright stated that these streets all provide serious mobility capability and staff wanted to go ahead and finish these streets. Mr. Wright stated that Harbuck is the only street in the City of Lufkin that has a condition that is unique in engineering, and longitudinally it is half concrete and half asphalt. Mr. Wright stated that Harbuck provides access into the Englewood Subdivision, which is an important access street. Mr. Wright stated that two churches have donated right-of-way for the City to realign Allendale. Mr. Wright stated that Kiln Street is a major neighborhood area that staff would like to go in and mill down and fix some drainage problems and do some localized base repairs.

Mr. Wright stated that looking at the number of overlays that were recommended by the engineers, staff realized that there is a great need for more street maintenance and ways to address those needs. Mr. Wright stated that the only way to do that is to increase the street maintenance budget as far as providing money for doing overlays and asphalt.

In response to question by Councilmember Robertson, Mr. Wright stated that the CIP streets that staff feels are a priority would cost \$6,341,000, and the residential streets as listed would be \$2,622,763. Mr. Wright stated that this would allow him to return some of the money that was taken out of Street maintenance back to street maintenance. Mr. Wright stated that we were originally funding \$4 million, so the money that would be used to amortize the debt with was coming out of the street department budget without a tax increase, so that money could be utilized in order to fund the \$2.6 million and put the rest of the money that we were amortizing with back into street

maintenance. Mr. Wright stated that the total of the CIP street and the residential streets is \$8,963,763.

Mr. Hager stated that one of the things that Mr. Wright brought out that is real important is the economics of whether we want to spend bond money for what we would classify as more of a maintenance process or do we want to apply money to reconstruct streets that will have a 10 to 15 year life. Mr. Hager stated that the economics would dictate that if you are going to maintain a street then you want to use current operating funds because you are going to get a dollars worth of assets for every dollar you pay. Mr. Hager stated that, if in fact we issue debt, we will get 50 to 60 cents on the dollar for assets and the other part of that will go to interest.

Mr. Hager stated that to refresh Council's memory on the Capital Improvements Program that was discussed last year, the items that were included in the Program included Police, Fire, Civic Center, Parks, Public Works, and Main Street. Mr. Hager stated that the total was \$13.3 million and with the Main Street program the amount is up to \$14 million. Mr. Hager stated that page 12 includes a list of the streets and the proposed year-to-year funding that it would require, which would be funded through the issuance of debt and refunded with the Street Department's budget. Mr. Hager stated that the program was anticipated to be a \$4 million program and that would require \$350,000 a year out of the Street Department budget for approximately 20 years. Mr. Hager stated that the other streets that would be included on the bond referendum would be Whitehouse, Angelina, Lotus Lane, Abney and Hill. Mr. Hager stated that these streets have been plugged in for the years 2002 and 2003 at a total of \$6.3 million. Mr. Hager stated that that timing would be dependent upon Council's desire to take this to the voters. Mr. Hager stated that if it were later those project costs would have to be adjusted time-wise. Mr. Hager stated that the grant total of the CIP Program is approximately \$22.9 million. The CIP on Mr. Hager's first slide was \$14 million, the Street Program coming out of current Council approved bonds is \$2.6 million rather than the \$4 million, and the voter approved street program that staff would like to have included in the bond program in May if Council so desires brings the total to \$22,976.6 million. Mr. Hager stated that from 2000 to 2003 there is a lot of activity, and may be a little aggressive. Mr. Hager stated that some of these projects may be pushed back in time either because of right-of-way acquisition or we have been a little aggressive or optimistic in our estimates. Mr. Hager stated that the City sold \$4.4 million this year and staff wants to avoid issuing debt in the year 2001. Mr. Hager stated that staff plans to draw down or to begin to issue the \$16 million in the asbestos/cement pipe replacement program from the State. Mr. Hager stated that the City would draw those funds down periodically as a reimbursement over the five-year period. Mr. Hager stated that for intents of arbitrage calculations and for small issuer advantages, staff wanted to go ahead and issue the \$16 million and that counts as an issue in 2001. Mr. Hager stated that staff would hope to reduce the issue in 2002 down to at least \$10 million to get some advantage in the interest rate. Mr. Hager stated that irrespective that \$6,300,000 would cost the voters about two cents. Mr. Hager stated that the street program that Council approved was a \$4 million program and what staff is recommending is \$2.6 million. Mr. Hager stated that as a result of that rather than transferring to debt service \$350,000, it would be reduced to \$239,500. Mr. Hager stated that the balance of \$110,500 would be applied to the street maintenance program.

Mr. Hager stated that the CIP that he just covered includes the Council-approved CIP of September 1999, street projects approved from the street-operating budget through debt issuance, the Main Street project approved by Council, and the major street projects recommended by staff. Mr. Hager stated that it is real important to understand that this does not include the TxDOT projects in which the City will participate and the other street projects included in the "2000 Street Improvement Program" developed by the consultants.

Mr. Hager stated that the items would be the projects that the Bond Study Committee or "Blue Ribbon Committee" would address or vote in May. Mr. Hager stated that staff believes that the issues are to look at a Bond Study Committee for the 2001 May election which will require a tax increase, and the street program (overlay vs reconstruction). Mr. Hager stated that staff would recommend the overlay program as a maintenance item and funding through the operating budget. Mr. Hager stated that

another issue is reconstruction which would be capital construction funded through voter approved tax supported debt. ‘

City Manager Maclin stated that when Council approved the Capital Improvements Program last year and the possibility of a bond election, not too long after that the City was requested by the County Judge to be patient and hold off on the City's bond election until the County had the jail bond election. Mr. Maclin stated that the City honored that request and the County has now set their election for August 12th for the jail bond election. Mr. Maclin stated that the original streets in the bond election of 1994 included Paul, Tulane, Feagin, MLK and White House Drive. Mr. Maclin stated that the Committee came back with a recommendation to Council that a nickel would be all that the citizens would accept as a tax increase and when they ranked the streets, White House Drive came out #5. Mr. Maclin stated that in the end White House was not included in the four streets that went to the voters in the election of 1994, which required a five-cent tax increase to amortize that debt. Mr. Maclin stated that staff would like to see if Council is ready to see a similar replication by putting this on the ballot of 2001. Mr. Maclin stated that this would give Council time to discuss this further as part of the budget process this year at the Retreat and the summer workshops, and perhaps appoint a committee in early fall to make sure they have adequate time to do not only a recommendation to the Council but assist in the passage of the bond election itself. Mr. Maclin stated that the Committee represented a broad cross-section of the community and part of their participation in 1994 was what helped that Bond election be successful.

City Manager Maclin stated that the other issue that was talked about is looking at the overwhelming need versus dollars on maintenance issues, such as overlays and maintenance type things, it is difficult to justify spending bond issuance dollars for maintenance like an overlay because it doesn't have a 20 year life. Mr. Maclin stated that staff would want to explore other ways of increasing our maintenance allocations and one thing that has been done in other communities is a referendum where the taxpayers are given the option of saying "one cent per year for five years", or "two cents or three cents for a program", etc. Mr. Maclin stated that amount of money will be added to the tax rate and that money will be dedicated or earmarked for street maintenance only. Mr. Maclin stated that that would be a progressive way without having a huge one time tax increase to gradually increase the street maintenance budget with the funds being dedicated strictly for street maintenance and over a period of time build up that fund to where it can actually do some good in terms of accomplishing what it needs to accomplish. Mr. Maclin stated that under the premise that after a period of years you achieve what needed to be achieved the Council would then have the option of discontinuing that. Mr. Maclin stated that if this is done through a non-binding referendum, it is a way of taking the pulse of the public to give them a voice but doesn't lock Council in one way or another. Mr. Maclin stated that a non-binding referendum is a tool that is used in many cases just to say, "what do you the public have to say about this, let us know through the ballot". Mr. Maclin stated that for every penny in tax rate increase at our current valuation, you get between \$120 - \$125,000. Mr. Maclin stated that at three-quarters of a cent per year for five years, that would add about \$93,000 to the street maintenance budget per year. Mr. Maclin stated that staff has taken this approach in other areas, water and sewer for example, and knew that it would require about a 10-12% increase in water and sewer rates to replace \$16 million worth of asbestos-cement pipe. Mr. Maclin stated that what staff chose to do to minimize the direct one-time impact to the citizens is to phase that 10% increase in 2% increments over a five-year period, so that it wouldn't drastically impact the budget of a fixed-income citizen. Mr. Maclin stated that might be a consideration that Council would want to consider through a referendum. Mr. Maclin stated that Council could have a binding referendum, or a non-binding referendum. Mr. Maclin stated that the issue that Council faces with a binding referendum is that if it fails, you have your back against the wall. Mr. Maclin stated that a three cent referendum for street maintenance improvements, dedicated and ear-marked only for street maintenance, and can only be spent on street maintenance, and then the citizens vote it down, and we still have the street needs. Mr. Maclin stated that staff has identified \$13 million of street improvements that need to be done over the next five to seven years. Mr. Maclin stated that he wanted to point out that a binding referendum has a double-edged sword approach to it, although it has been used successfully in other communities, particularly as it is dedicated strictly for streets. Mr. Maclin stated that if the public knows that that increase cannot be spent on the parks, cannot be spent on the library, or other issues other than streets, sometimes that gives it the support it needs to get over the hump of an affirmative majority. Mr. Maclin stated that, as he mentioned at the on-set of this meeting, we don't have to resolve all these issues today. Mr. Maclin stated that the main thing he would seek from Council today as far as a decision is to give staff the green light on the \$2.6 million. Mr. Maclin stated that Council had basically already approved \$4.4 million and staff is asking that this figure be bumped back to \$2.6 million and give those that have the greatest need based on the definition that has been explained to

Council today, and whatever money left over put it back into Street maintenance to go back and begin picking off one-by-one that long list of \$13 million, particularly as it relates to those that are maintenance. Mr. Maclin stated that if Council would let staff use that as a start and then from there in the next couple of months we begin to develop a plan and take some of these ideas and delete them and add to them, and get Council's focus as to what best meets the public need and then staff will implement that as part of the 2000-2001 budget, amend the Capital Improvements Program and go from there.

Councilmember Bowman stated that it would help Council if Mr. Maclin would give an overview of what kind of burden the taxpayers will face. Councilmember Bowman stated that the biggest project Council faces is to bring water in from Lake Rayburn. Councilmember Bowman asked if taxes would have to be raised or water rates increased to fund the water project. Mr. Maclin stated that he would not recommend the General Fund for this project. Mr. Maclin stated that since 1991 the City has had a fairly clear separation of fund between General Fund, Utility Fund and Solid Waste Fund. Mr. Maclin stated that in 1993 Council made the Solid Waste Fund an Enterprise Fund meaning it was no longer subsidized by property taxes. It was sustained solely by the fees that are charged for the service.

Mr. Hager stated that if you use tax dollars your taxpayers will pay for that, but not all of the water rate payers are taxpayers, consequently you are subsidizing some people outside your tax base that you may not want to do. Mr. Hager stated that is, wholesale water to Huntington, etc. Mr. Maclin stated that the report is due next month and at the second meeting in May, he would think that Goodwin-Lasiter, Camp Dresser McKee and a host of engineers who were used for the feasibility study will want to make their final report to Council. Mr. Maclin stated that in that report Council will get answers to those questions in terms of what the impact will be to the water and sewer rates. Mr. Maclin stated that there would be a lot of "what ifs" – what if the City becomes a regional water supplier and is able to retain an additional 10,000 connections (Huntington, Zavalla, Four Way, Angelina, North Jasper County, and possibly some others). Mr. Maclin stated that there will come a day within the next decade that you will not legally be able to drill another deep water well in Angelina County at least where the good water is. Mr. Maclin stated that if you are going north which is where the better quality of water in the Carrizo Aquifer is, there will come a time in the not too distant future where mathematically to meet the TNRCC requirements of the minimum of one mile radius you won't be able to drill any wells. Mr. Maclin stated that there would come a time when Central and Hudson, as fast as they are growing, will run out of space. Mr. Wright stated that if Nacogdoches County passes the groundwater district, the City of Lufkin would not be able to go across the river.

Mr. Maclin stated that staff had met with Donohoe last Friday talking about ground water and surface water and various issues. Mr. Maclin stated that Donohoe had just done a new ground water report from Guiden who is one of the premier water engineering firms in America and they were comparing how that one compared with the report the City had Goodwin-Lasiter do about three years ago and there were a lot of similarities and overlap. Mr. Maclin stated that as far as the issue about water planning he could not overstate the importance of it.

City Manager Maclin stated that the water issue is one that staff will have more definitive answers to but does not think at this point that it will be a tax impact as much as it will be a water rate impact. Mr. Maclin stated that there is no question that will be a burden on the taxpayer. Councilmember Bowman stated that the citizens get sensitive about aggregate burdens.

In response to question by Councilmember Gorden, Mr. Maclin stated that one other possible need was with TxDOT. Mr. Maclin stated that, conservatively speaking, they would be hitting the City up for probably \$1.2 and \$1.8-1.9 million for right-of-way on 59 South. In response to question by Councilmember Gorden, Mr. Maclin stated that the City does not have an option in terms of paying, but in terms of how we pay it we have plenty of options, and issuing debt is the primary one. In response of question by Councilmember Gorden, Mr. Maclin stated that the total cost for that portion is \$22 million. Mr. Maclin stated that the City would also have some utility relocation costs. Mr. Maclin stated that \$1.1 million as 10% of \$11 million, and the other portion will come from White House. Mr. Maclin stated that White House from the Loop to the new Tulane (formerly known as David Street), TxDOT will pay 80% of the construction cost, and originally staff was talking about 100% of that cost when we were discussing the CIP last year. Mr. Maclin stated that 20% of \$2.2 - \$2.5 million would probably be the cost of that project. Mr. Maclin stated that the White House Street as shown in the power point presentation is White House Street east of David Street, all the way over to FM 58, and finishing the White House connection. Councilmember Gorden asked what kind of impact on the City's tax rate does Mr. Maclin envision in terms of TxDOT. Mr. Maclin stated that we are probably looking at ¾'s of a cent to a cent, worse case scenario, if it is amortized for 20 years.

Mr. Maclin stated that staff recommendation would be to include these costs in the CIP Program. Councilmember Bowman asked that before the next Council meeting that Mr. Maclin provide Council with a list of the major projects that we are facing – streets, water from Rayburn, TxDOT improvements, U. S. 59 South and any others that he sees as major projects for the City and an estimate of the costs. Mr. Maclin stated that he would anticipate having these numbers by the time staff and Council go to the retreat.

Councilmember Robertson asked if \$350,000 for the Street maintenance program was enough to fund all the work that needed to be done. Mr. Wright indicated that the actual number is astronomical. Mr. Robertson stated that Council needed to know what it would take to maintain a good street system in the City of Lufkin. Mr. Wright stated that it sounds like Mr. Robertson is talking about a depreciation fund for streets.

In response to question by Councilmember Boyd, Mr. Wright stated that he would like to repair the residential streets similar to what was done on Daniel McCall Drive and Culverhouse and try to save as much money as possible as far as the asphalt pavement by letting City crews do the asphalt work. Mr. Wright stated that the City can hire a contractor to prepare the stabilization, the base material, and do the concrete curb and gutter and City crews can do a pretty good job doing the asphalt work. Mr. Wright stated that the cost that Council has on these residential streets is based on contracted costs, but he would like to save as much money as possible. Mr. Wright stated that City crews will do some of the engineering work and some of the engineering costs will be farmed out to those engineers who participated in the cost estimates.

Councilmember Boyd stated that several years ago the residents in his neighborhood paid to have concrete streets and curb and gutter but the contractors did such a poor job that most of the streets have cracked.

Motion was made by Councilmember Don Boyd and seconded by Councilmember R. L. Kuykendall to approve the staff recommendation of the revision of the street maintenance program from \$4.4 million to \$2.6 million. A unanimous affirmative vote was recorded.

3. COMMENTS

In response to question by Councilmember Gorden, Mr. Wright stated that the work on Angelina Street would be done from Raguet all the way up to Abney. Mr. Gorden stated that he would like to see a totally new street built in Lufkin, and Angelina Street is a good example, where it would do the City the most good in an undeveloped section of town. Mr. Wright stated that staff had looked at an area for a new street in the CIP Program and it was south of Loop 287 and would have gone between U. S. 59 and FM 819, which would have given good mobility and provide for some new development. Mr. Wright stated that when they got the master drainage plan in there was a large portion that was in the flood plain and the flood way. Mr. Gorden stated that there is a lot of undeveloped land north of Frank Street. Mr. Gorden asked if the City could do something to help this area develop as opposed to having people going outside the City limits for residential and commercial purposes. Mr. Wright stated that this could be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Bronaugh stated that the Council needs to encourage TxDOT to complete the study of Frank Street from around Memorial Hospital to the West Loop. City Manager Maclin stated that the Mayor had asked TxDOT about this study before and their comment was that they are waiting for the US 69 overpass at Loop 287 to be complete because they are of the firm belief that that will change traffic patterns. Mr. Maclin stated that after the traffic patterns are changed then they will go back and re-do their counts and that is what the hold up is.

4. There being no further business for consideration, meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.


Louis Bronaugh
Mayor

ATTEST:


Atha Stokes Martin - City Secretary