

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Wichita, Kansas, January 19, 1999
Tuesday, 5:34 P.M.

The City Council met in special session with Mayor Knight in the Chair. Council Members Cole, Ferris, Gale, Kamen, Lambke, Rogers; present.

Chris Cherches, City Manager; Gary Rebenstorf, Director of Law; Pat Burnett, City Clerk; present.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NW SEWER

PUBLIC HEARING - NORTHWEST SEWER MASTER PLAN. (District V)
Continued from July 14, 1998.

David Warren

Director of Water and Sewer reviewed the Item.

Agenda Report No. 99-045.

In recent years, northwest Wichita, along with northeast areas, have experienced significant growth and development. This growth is expected to continue. According to development trends, Wichita's west growth area is projected to experience a population increase of over 35,000 during the 30-year period. Growth is primarily occurring in the far west area - - located approximately 12 to 14 miles from the City's existing wastewater treatment plants. Due to the magnitude of new development, the Water and Sewer Department has informed developers that new sewer extensions to serve future development will be limited due to capacity issues. Absent municipal water and sewer services, there is a concern that uncontrolled development may occur and result in the utilization of local treatment options, such as package treatment plants, septic tanks and lagoons. Due to the growth that has already taken place and/or planned, wastewater facilities in the area are becoming overloaded, creating an environment and concern where, without added facilities, sewer back-ups and spills could occur.

The planned updating of the City's Sewer Master Plan was originally scheduled to be completed in 2001; however, because of the current and planned growth in the far west part of the City, it was determined that Staff should proceed with a component of that plan for service to northwest Wichita and not wait for the completion of a City-wide plan to be completed. Based upon the demands of current and planned future growth and development, the limited capacity of the sanitary sewer system, and the proposed local treatment options being considered by developers, the City Council authorized (March 4, 1997) retaining the services of a national engineering firm to assist staff with developing a plan to meet current and projected sewer system needs in the western part of the City. The consulting firm of Brown & Caldwell, with expertise in sanitary sewer systems, was retained to work with the local engineering firm, Professional Engineering Consultants (PEC), to assist in development of the Northwest Sewer Master Plan.

In 1998, the Northwest Sewer Master Plan was completed and the recommendations of the consultants were presented to the City Council. Following these presentations, Staff was directed to initiate a public information/education effort to communicate the elements of the proposed Northwest Sewer Master Plan to the community, particularly the residents in the western part of the City.

Specific actions were taken to publicize the proposed Plan, including: distribution of informational flyers, conducting a public information fair, development and distribution of an informational video; providing tours of similar area wastewater treatment plants; and production of a televised "Ask City Hall" segment on the City's cable channel. Following the series of public information efforts, the City Council held a public hearing on the proposed Northwest Sewer

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

Master Plan. On July 14, 1998, the City Council received comments on the three alternatives presented in the Plan. Those alternatives include:

1. NP-1 Alternative: Construction of a new wastewater treatment plant - - west of 119th Street West and north of 21st Street North - - and other sewage collection system improvements to carry flows to the new facility. [This alternative would reduce the amount of sewage flowing from northwest Wichita to Sewage Treatment Plants 1 & 2.]
2. P2-1 Alternative: Construction of a new gravity sanitary sewer interceptor that would replace the Cowskin Sewage Lift Station and construction of other sewer collection improvements. [This would carry all sewage from northwest Wichita to Sewage Plants 1 & 2.]
3. P2-2 Alternative: Construction of an extraneous flow basin next to the Cowskin Sewage Lift Station to hold/retain peak sewer flows until the existing sewer system could handle the added sewage, and construction of parallel sewer interceptors to handle future flows. [This alternative would carry all flows from northwest Wichita to Sewage Treatment Plants 1 & 2.]

In additional, all of the alternatives (above) would include improvements to the City's existing Sewage Treatment Plant #2 (secondary clarifiers, final clarifiers, influent piping, headworks pumping, and disinfection facilities).

The City's consulting engineers and City Staff have recommended Alternative, NP- 1, the construction of a new wastewater treatment facility located in northwest Wichita.

Because of the concerns expressed by area residents and the objections to a new sewage treatment plant proposed to serve the western growth area, the City Council, acting upon the recommendation of the District Council Member (Mr. Greg Ferris), appointed a Northwest Sewer Study Committee to evaluate the consultants study and recommendations and prepare a report with recommendations to the City Council. Council Members Greg Ferris and Joan Cole were asked to serve on this Committee. The Study Committee was comprised of four residents from northwest area who were involved in another residents group formed to address the proposed Northwest Sewer Plan (Citizens for Responsible Planning and Growth) along with a representative of CPO Council #5 and an independent engineer (one who was not involved with this project). Three other residents were also appointed: one from the Moorings development and two from South Wichita . A staff person from the local engineering consulting firm and the Water and Sewer Director also served on the Study Committee as ex-officio members.

This Study Group met once a week for approximately eighteen (18) weeks. During this period of time, additional information was provided which included additional studies/information from outside experts, staff research and data, and additional discussions with the City's consulting engineers. The Committee examined numerous issues, including such matters as: creek hydrology, rate impact, capital cost, present value, environmental impact, alternative pipeline construction techniques, and other pertinent information.

During the course of its review, the Study Committee requested a third expert review of the costs of the three alternatives, as presented in the Northwest Sewer Master Plan, and the appropriateness of alternative pipeline construction techniques. In response, the City Council engaged the services of Montgomery Watson, another large national engineering firm with special expertise in construction techniques. This Dallas, Texas firm concluded that the proposed NP-1 Alternative, building a new sewage treatment facility, would be the most cost effective option, when compared to additional pipeline construction for transport and treatment.

Because of the growth being experienced and the planned development in the northwestern part of the City, it is imperative that the necessary improvements be made in the City's sewer system to handle projected capacity/needs. The proposed Northwest Sewer Master Plan contains recommendations - - utilizing the expertise of national and local engineering firms - - to address these sewage transport, disposal and treatment requirements. A third (national) engineering firm has verified the results and essentially validated the recommendations that constructing a new sewage treatment facility was the most cost effective alternative when compared to the other options.

The majority of a special citizen Study Committee (formed to address neighborhood issues and concerns associated with a new treatment plant) likewise concluded that Alternative NP-1 - - constructing a new sewer treatment facility in northwest Wichita, along with improvements to the collection system and upgrades to the existing Sewage Treatment Plant #2, was the best option presented.

The following reasons are the basis for this recommendation:

Construction of a new northwest sewer treatment facility and related system modifications represents the lowest initial capital cost.

Construction of a new facility offers the greatest long-term flexibility for providing service to the study area. This means that the new plant could be designed so that it can be expanded only as is needed to accommodate future growth/demand.

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

Construction of a new facility would provide for the possibility of expanding future service areas. That is, the new plant offers the opportunity to serve future growth and development beyond the study area.

Due to its size and newness, this plant would more readily and cost efficiently adapt to new technology for sewage treatment as it becomes available.

This recommendation also takes into account the following concerns expressed by citizens during the review process, such as: odor, creek flooding/erosion, creek environmental impact, industrial zoning, property valuations, cost, ratepayer impact, site selection, and availability of other alternatives. A majority of the Study Committee believed that these issues have been adequately addressed during its review of the proposed Plan.

A summation of the conclusions by the Study Committee and/or members of these issues follows:

Odor Generation and Control: The perception of odor stems from the operations of the current sewage treatment facility, which is an older facility and is located a great distance from where sewer flows originate. New technology, coupled with the difference in size of the proposed new facility (36 million gallons at the old site versus 2-4 million gallons at the new plant), and the proximity to the area where the sewage originates, mitigates this concern.

Flooding of Cowskin Creek: Research and calculations by the City's expert engineers indicate that construction of a new plant will not have a negative impact on the Cowskin Creek. At the highest levels of treatment, this plant will not add a significant volume of water to the Creek. Coupled with a heavy rain event, a plant would add - at most - four to six million gallons per day. The added depth of this amount would be so small in relation to the flows that it cannot be measured.

Erosion of Cowskin Creek: While erosion is of concern and a real problem along the Cowskin Creek, there is no factual evidence that a new plant will increase erosion because the volume of discharge is insignificant.

Environmental Impact on the Cowskin Creek: The proposed new plant will be designed to have back-up provisions for electric power so that in the event of unusual circumstances, such as a power outage due to weather conditions, the plant will continue to operate. This back-up system will ensure that raw sewage will continue to be treated and not discharge into the Creek. Another alternative to protect the environment is to construct a retention pond to receive the discharge. This possibility would also ensure that no raw sewage reached the Cowskin Creek. The proposed treatment facility would be designed so that effluent would be treated to "swimming pool standards." If this water is too clean for Creek standards and would disrupt the ecosystem, it could be discharged into a wetland area and then be allowed to flow into the Cowskin Creek.

Industrial Zoning: The existence of a treatment facility will not necessarily allow industrial zoning to proliferate in the area around the plant. If the treatment plant is the selected alternative, the intent is for sufficient land to be acquired to provide a large-area buffer zone with appropriate screening to provide an aesthetically-pleasing appearance. The plant site will be a "conditional use" within the underlying zoning classification for the area.

Property Valuations: There is no conclusive evidence that construction of a sewage treatment plant will impact property values. Perception may impact valuation of properties immediately surrounding the plant; however, based upon experience in other locales, once the plant is in operation for a period of time the impact diminishes. A new plant should be built at an acceptable distance from existing residential development to address real or perceived decreases in property values.

Cost and Ratepayer Impact: Engineering studies all support construction of a new facility as being the most cost effective. Research on trenchless technology has not found this method to be necessarily a more cost effective alternative for

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

transporting effluent to the existing treatment facility. However, the cost differential between pipeline construction to the existing treatment facility and the cost for a new area treatment facility may not result in a significant impact on the rate payer's monthly bill, when costs are spread over a 20-year time period.

Siting: Siting a pipeline route will be determined by existing right-of-way, geography and topography. There may well be some local disruption and inconveniences caused from construction, but it will not have a long-term impact. Siting a new treatment facility is more difficult and defining a location will depend upon the proximity to existing residential development, the proximity to a receiving stream, the neighboring road system, and land elevations. Additionally, the availability and cost of land acquisition will also be a factor. In determining sites, two - four locations - both in and outside of the Cowskin Creek area - should be studied and evaluated for City Council consideration based, upon the above criteria and other necessary considerations.

The second alternative (P2-1 Alternative), was seen to have significant disadvantages over the construction of a new treatment facility, including such primary concerns as:

Transportation of sewage for long distances will result in septic conditions, meaning oxygen has been consumed in the decomposition of organic material. This will result in odoriferous conditions.

These conditions also result in the creation of noxious compounds which are corrosive and which will deteriorate the transport lines and treatment facilities.

Options for Consideration: Without a defined sewer growth management plan, constraints on sewer capacity will impact growth within the City and lead developers to find other temporary and less environmentally-sound means for supporting consumer demands for new housing in growth areas, such as in the northwest part of the City. Such other means may include migration of development into outlying areas/municipalities; utilization of private sewer systems or package treatment plants; or creation of new sewer districts. Unless the City adopts a "no growth" alternative, there is not a responsible "do nothing" alternative. The options for City Council consideration, based upon the Northwest Sewer Master Plan, input from citizens, staff research, and professional engineering recommendations, include the following:

Option #1) Approve the recommended NP-1 Alternative (construction of a new sewage treatment plant and other improvements to serve northwest Wichita), and direct staff to engage an engineer to conduct site evaluation studies for locating the treatment plant, both inside and outside the Cowskin Creek basin.

Option #2) Approve the P2-1 Alternative (construction of a new major sewage interceptor line and other improvements). Trenchless piping and other innovative construction techniques would be used whenever practical, appropriate and/or most economical.

On January 7, 1999, the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC) considered the Study Committee reports and other information related to the proposed Northwest Sewer Master Plan and unanimously supported NP-1, along with the recommendation that a site be located a minimum distance of 1 ½ miles from existing developed areas.

The proposed Northwest Sewer Plan is also under consideration by the CPO Neighborhood Councils.

To date, four (4) of the six Councils have met. CPO Council #1 voted to recommend approval of a new sewer treatment plan; CPO #2 supported proceeding with site selection for a new sewer treatment facility and recommendations from Councilman Ferris (reference page 13 of his report). CPO #6 voted in support of a sewer plant and proceeding with site studies. CPO #5 voted to support the sewer treatment option and proceeding with site evaluations. CPO Councils #3 and #4 have not met at the writing of this report. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council prior to the City Council hearing.

The estimated capital cost for construction of a new plant, with related improvements is estimated to be approximately \$29 million. Included in this cost are such major components as: (1) New treatment plant (\$8.8 million); (2) Sewer pipelines (\$6.6 Million); (3) Sewage pumping stations (\$4.6 million); and (4) Plant #2 improvements (\$9 million). These capital projects will be funded from the City's Sewer Capital Improvements Fund and, if necessary, from future bond issues.

A pro forma, which included funds for sewer improvements in Northwest Wichita, projected a possible five percent rate adjustment in years 2000 -2002, and a three percent increase in 2003; much of which would fund debt service related to the sewer improvements.

The City Council has the responsibility to provide adequate sewer utility services and authority to provide needed capital projects.

Mayor Knight

Mayor Knight inquired whether anyone wished to be heard.

Wes Galyon

Wes Galyon, Wichita Area Homebuilders' Association (WABA), said the Association had, early on, requested an early

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

decision so builders would know what is going to be done. The WABA supports construction of a northwest facility. The WABA would also accept other recommendations if all other considerations were equal. The WABA would not support a more expensive alternative that might not be sufficient.

The WABA urges approval of, and supports construction of, a northwest facility as soon as possible.

Steve Brown

Steve Brown, 11402 West Lost Creek Circle, said he trusted surveys and flood plain maps when his home was built two and one-half years ago; however, he recently had three feet of water in his basement.

A treatment plant may be needed but the Council should take time to explore all options of how and where to take waste. This issue is about quality of life for the residents of the City of Wichita. All options should be explored.

Q. Stephens

Q. Stephens, 1551 old Wick Road, said the Northwest Sewer Task Force was a sham. Information was not forthcoming from Staff.

Mr. Stephens said he had lived next to the Cowskin Creek since 1957 and, from personal knowledge, the Cowskin Creek cannot handle the effluent of a wastewater treatment plant. There should never be a Cowskin wastewater treatment plant.

James Keenan

James Keenan, 2121 North Parkridge, spoke in opposition to a northwest sewer plant. A sewer plant dumping into the Cowskin Creek is wrong. The Cowskin is not a suitable waterway for a sewer plant.

There is concern for residences established along the Cowskin.

Sally Loehr

Sally Loehr, 2504 Ceder Downs Lane, said the Ceder Downs neighborhood anticipated annexation but not a sewer plant. Study has been done and Ms. Loehr has concluded she does not want a sewer plant. All of the reasons in favor of a sewer plant have been refuted by the City's own research.

The sewer plant in south Wichita is operating at 50 percent so why not expand that plant. There should be sewer pipes to protect the quality of life for the northwest citizens.

The FEMA evaluation of the northwest area should be completed before a decision is made.

The plants at Haysville, Derby, and 4-Mile Creek all use new technology but reports from residents located near each plant have said the plants smell bad an average of one time per month.

Bill Murray

Bill Murray, 1314 North Prescott, stated that neither wild life nor residents are being considered. Mr. Murray said he moved to the northwest area to get into a nice area. There will be trucks, employees, and other things that have not been considered.

Vaughn Sink

Vaughn Sink said the width between the banks of the Cowskin Creek varies from 15 feet to 100 feet. It is ludicrous to believe the level of water would be raised only one-half inch regardless of the width of the Creek.

If effluent is all the Cowskin Creek carries during certain periods, the Cowskin is already doing its share of carrying treated water.

Holding ponds were not supposed to be part of the plant but now they are being considered.

Council Member Ferris

Council Member Ferris explained that the holding ponds being recommended are not for sludge, just effluent.

Larry Ross

Larry Ross, 346 North Bluff, said the City-wide master plan for the year 2000 should be moved to coincide with the northwest sewer plan. The City should also be environmentally sensitive and not construct in the flood plain. There should be consideration for greywater use and wildlife.

Barry Raugust

Barry Raugust, 11301 Lost Creek Circle, Wichita East High School Biology teacher, said the estimate was that a 7.8" rain would raise the Creek to 53". In actuality, an 8" rain, the first day the water was at 90" and crested at 11:00 p.m. on October 1st. An 8" rain could raise the water to 135" to 140".

The data on simulated rains is not anywhere near accurate. When the Creek is at low flow, after a 4 to 4.5" rain, water is up in residential yards. If an additional two to four million gallons per day is added to the creek, then only a three inch rain would put water into residential yards.

The threat of flooding is increased greatly. The Cowskin is no place to dump additional flows of water.

Lloyd Folger

Lloyd Folger, 417 East 56th Street South, said he has lived in the south area of Wichita since 1944 and he has not been

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

informed when any sewer plant in Wichita was going to double in size.

Sewage lines shipping sewage to another sewage plant would not allow other areas of Wichita to grow and the recommendation is short-sighted and selfish.

Sewage plants should be built in the north part of Wichita. It is time for people to take the burden of growth for their own area.

- Bill Easton Bill Easton, 1617 Old Wick Road, said effluent should not go through back yards and a sewer plant should not be in the northwest area.
- Dorothy Matthew Dorothy Matthew, 2355 Forestview, said a sewer plant is needed but there is concern regarding the location. The City should look at the cost and the long-term impact. There are too many homes west of 119th. The sewer plant should be placed west of 135th. There is going to be a new highway constructed between Maize and Goddard. The sewer plant should be considered at the same time.
- Rick Glenn Rick Glenn, 12109 Cornelison Circle, said that, due to the terrain, the trenchless technique is much different when used in the Kansas City area than what it would be when used in Wichita. Fort Worth, Texas, was also used as a comparison to Wichita; however, Fort Worth has 450,000 people and only one treatment plant. The trenchless technique would save up to forty percent. On a recent City project, bids were for \$500,000 but the work actually cost \$300,000.
- Mr. Glenn said the City had acquired the services of Realtor Ed Roberts, Real Estate Resources, 13th and West Streets, to inquire along the Cowskin Creek to see who might be inclined to sell their property to the City. This alters the process and again raises the suspicions of the public.
- Discussion was had by the Council, City Manager, and the Director of Water and Sewer and it was determined that Mr. Roberts was unknown.
- Council Member Ferris Council Member Ferris requested information on how to reach Mr. Roberts so it could be determined if, and why, inquiries are being made.
- Ron Jacobson Ron Jacobson, 444 South Wetmore Drive, spoke of concern regarding the buyout option versus flood control. Mr. Jacobson said he was adamantly opposed to a vote to evaluate site options and proceed with a northwest plant. Septic and lagoons in the area would be a mistake.
- The City has approved hiring a consultant to evaluate the entire City's sewage treatment and this report is not due for five to six months. There should not be a decision on the northwest area until the report is complete for the entire City.
- Deb Umberger Deb Umberger, 12022 Autumn Ridge Court, spoke about odor from an alcohol plant on the west side. Ms. Umberger said she had not found anyone who supported a treatment plant on the Cowskin Creek in the residential area.
- Amy Manning Amy Manning, 2143 Tealbrook Court, spoke in opposition to a new plant that would be more expensive than other alternatives. Ms. Manning said the plant should be built at the Kingsbury site.
- Mary Kay Raple Mary Kay Raple, St. Marks, said the Kingsbury site was more appropriate than any site along the Cowskin would be. Also, there was no representation on the study group from St. Marks.
- St. Marks has not added to the sewage in the area. Please do not add to St. Mark's problems.
- Gordon Bassham Gordon Bassham, 12113 Ridge Point, urged the Council to remember the rain and flood of Halloween, 1998; remember the alternative technology available; and do the right thing.
- Margaret A. Stewart Margaret A. Stewart, 4033 North Amidon, said Kingsbury area residents already have trash and traffic, and urged the Council to not add a sewage plant to the area.
- David Warren Director of Water and Sewer responded to concerns and answered questions from the Council.
- It is not believed that flooding studies that will follow in the wake of the event of the Halloween flood of 1999 will do anything to change the need for facilities to address the capacity issues in northwest Wichita. If anything, the outcome of the studies may to modify, to some degree, the protection against a flood event that would need to be afforded to construction, in particular, of the treatment facilities. Those studies will be completed long before the design and permitting of a northwest facility.
- When the computer studies that were prepared by PEC were compared against various observations, at the time the observations were made, there was very little difference between actualities and the studies.

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

The City currently has a capacity problem in northwest Wichita. The City's system, in several areas, is at capacity to transport from the existing areas, much less any new growth in the area. Unless the Governing Body wishes to make a decision for no growth in northwest Wichita, there is a mandate that the City move forward in order to provide the facilities that are being demanded in that area by the consumers of new housing and commercial development. Waiting for the City-wide master plan is not going to modify what needs to be done. This basin has been thoroughly studied over a twelve to fourteen-month period.

City Staff and the engineer will look at sites and provide sites for Council consideration that are within the Cowskin basin and outside the Cowskin basin. The City Council will have cost and other considerations for the decision making process.

It is not believed the trenchless technology is thoroughly understood by those who are not conversant in the technology and techniques. There have been situations where trenchless technology has been very competitive with the open-cut technology but there have also been other situations where open-cut technology is better, in terms of cost, than trenchless technology. The situation depends upon the construction situation in terms of groundwater, soil condition, and depth of cut, whether or not trenchless technology is competitive. The City and Staff have employed, and will continue to employ in the future, nearly all the trenchless technologies at one time or another on the basis of what is the most prudent to do.

In this case, the City's attempt to involve the public was unprecedented. The City has something to learn from this case. Had the City involved a citizen committee on the front-end, the current status of the project would have been reached many months ago. There probably would have been no less opposition.

The Kingsbury site could be a site to be evaluated during the siting studies. However, recharging the equus beds means that treated wastewater would have to be moved into an area where recharge is needed, an additional twelve to fourteen miles north of the City. There is a recharge project in place.

The location and design of a facility will have to satisfy the permitting process, KDHE, that the facility will be adequately protected against flooding. It is possible to have flow basins at the plant.

The classification of untreated sewage sludge is hazardous waste. There is a certain amount of hazard or risk involved in anything. "I would not think that the transportation of sewage sludge from this facility is as hazardous as many things that move through our community today." The EPA has classified it as sewage sludge.

Council Member Kamen Council Member Kamen requested information regarding why Ft. Worth, Texas, was used as a comparison to Wichita.

Council Member Ferris Council Member Ferris said the thirteen appraisers polled by the City indicated that there would be no impact on property values outside of one-half to one mile of a plant. Council Member Ferris said it is his feeling the sites should be more than one and one-half miles from current major residential development.

Council Member Ferris said he had heard nothing at this hearing that would cause him to think that his recommendations are not good recommendations. There is nothing in his report that says the City should build a plant on the Cowskin.

When the City first started this process, the consultant and Staff thought pipelines were going to be built. In an effort to do the best job possible, the consultants soon realized that the best solution was a plant. In the future, the City needs not to assume an answer, rather to do education and information of the public up front at the very beginning.

Council Member Ferris stated that his recommendation is that the City should proceed with site selection of a new sewer treatment plant. The City should also contract with a professional consulting firm to accomplish this. These processes should include sites both in and out of the Cowskin basin. Siting should be based on the items listed in the siting recommendations. The sites should be more than one and one-half miles from current major residential development. (Once a plant is built, homes could be built closer to the plant.) Sites large enough to accommodate the plant, expansion, significant buffering, and landscaping would be considered. If the site is in the Cowskin Creek basin, it must be large enough for outflow retention ponds and wetlands. Sites out of the Cowskin basin should also be given careful consideration. Sites made voluntarily available for sale, or city owned land, should be given first consideration.

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

Once the sites are evaluated, they should be narrowed to two to four sites for Council consideration. When they appear before the Council, cost estimates for each sites should be provided. These costs should include all the recommendations included in this report. These include 100 and 500 year flood protection and alternative power. No solid treatment should take place on this site unless there are major changes in technology and economics.

Council Member Cole Council Member Cole said it is critical to move forward and look at specific sites.

Mayor Knight Mayor Knight spoke in support of Council Member Ferris and said the site will be just about everything on this issue.

Motion -- Ferris moved that the City select a new sewer treatment plant option as the solution for the northwest sewer master plan; Staff be instructed to contract with a professional consulting firm to select a site; the site should only be limited in that it should be in or near the study area; sites more than one and one-half mile from current major residential development be rated at a higher level than those that are not; in the costing analysis, significant buffering, room for expansion, and landscaping would be considered; there be consideration of retention ponds and wetlands, and those would be discussed in detail on how they would be engineered and how they would be accommodated in the plan; the costs should be broken down so the Council can have a clear and decisive opinion on what the actual true costs are (and it may be that, when the costs are determined, the Council may determine not to do a sewer treatment plant because the costs are too high); Staff look at all of the recommendations from the members of the Committee on all of the issues and use the recommendations however possible in the siting analysis; there be a minimum of three sites with four to six sites if available; a ranking system be used and made available; and that the Kingsbury be included as one of the sites that is fully analyzed. Motion carried 7 to 0.

-- carried

RECESS The City Council recessed at 7:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:07 p.m.
Council Member Rogers absent.

NEW BUSINESS

TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION 2000 RESOLUTION.

Council Member Rogers present.

Chris Cherches City Manager reviewed the Resolution of support for the proposed State Transportation 2000 Plan which identified highway, airport, short line railroad, and public transit needs.

Council Member Ferris Council Member Ferris said improvements at the interchanges at I-235 and Central, and I-235 and Kellogg were a matter of deadly safety.

Council Member Cole Council Member Cole said she was glad to see that the Committee had assigned significance to public transportation. If much of the Plan is eliminated, the City of Wichita should indicate an interest in public transportation.

Mayor Knight Mayor Knight inquired whether anyone wished to be heard.

Karl Peterjohn Karl Peterjohn, Executive Director of Kansas Tax Payers Network, spoke in opposition to the Resolution because it not a specific plan, just an outline.

Kansas may need additional spending in transportation but there is no indication how the increase could be achieved. Too great an increase in gas or sales tax would be required to support the program.

Toby Elster Toby Elster spoke against raising the amount for transportation to \$4.3 billion and then letting the Topeka politicians "play with it." The amount approved should be for specific projects.

Bob Schreck Bob Schreck spoke regarding the very serious condition caused by the great amount of traffic back-up where I-235 and I-35 come together. There will be a traffic fatality.

Motion -- carried Knight moved that the Resolution be adopted. Motion carried 7 to 0.

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL 167

JANUARY 19, 1999

RESOLUTION NO. R-99-020

A Resolution in support of a Comprehensive Transportation Plan for the State of Kansas, presented. Knight moved that the Resolution be adopted. Motion carried 7 to 0. Ayes: Cole, Ferris, Gale, Kamen, Lambke, Rogers, Knight.

ADJOURNMENT The City Council meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Pat Burnett
City Clerk