



**City of Broken Arrow**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Drainage Advisory Committee**

*Chair Lori Hendricks*  
*Vice Chair Denise Mason*  
*Member Amber Hamilton*  
*Member Johnnie Parks*  
*Member Donna Wallace*  
*Member Donna Wiedower*  
*Member Christi Gillespie*

---

**Monday, April 29, 2024**

**6:00 PM**

**Council Chambers**  
**220 South 1st Street**  
**Broken Arrow, OK**

---

**1. Call to Order**

Chairperson Lori Hendricks called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

**Present: 6 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**Absent: 1 -** Christi Gillespie (Christi Gillespie entered the meeting at 7:09 p.m.)

**3. Consideration of Consent Agenda**

**A. 24-478 Approval of Drainage Advisory Committee meeting minutes of January 29, 2024**

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Donna Wallace.

**Move to approve the Consent Agenda**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye: 5 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**Abstain: 1 -** Donna Wiedower

**4. Consideration of Items removed from the Consent Agenda**

There were no Items removed from the Consent Agenda; no action was taken or required.

**5. Presentations**

There were no presentations.

**6. General Committee Business**

**A. 24-559 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to NOT recommend to City Council to expend funds to repair and replace a wood retaining wall (Case No 24-003)**

Stormwater Division Manager Patrick Wilson reported this was in the Country Air Estates subdivision platted in 1976. He displayed and discussed a map showing the location of the property. He stated the project was in a floodway, adjacent to Haikey Creek (a blue line stream governed by the Army Corps of Engineers). He noted there was also a sanitary line which ran almost underneath the wall about 6 feet deep. He stated it was discovered there was no impact to any utilities on this site. He displayed photos of the retaining wall. He indicated upon investigation City Staff determined there was no public benefit which would enable expenditure of Proposition 6 funds. He displayed and discussed other photos and maps of the area. He stated City Staff recommended the Drainage Advisory Committee deny this application.

Committee Member Parks noted if there was no public benefit, then legally Proposition 6

funds could not be used for this project.

Mr. Wilson concurred.

Citizen Keith Koessel, the applicant, distributed additional photos to the Drainage Advisory Committee. He said he was not asking for the retaining wall to be fixed. He stated he was asking for big rocks and boulders to be brought in to fix the problem as the retaining wall was not sufficient. He stated the City did this for his neighbor and he was hoping the City would do the same for him.

Committee Member Donna Wiedower asked how the City did the work for Mr. Koessel's yard. She asked if it was accomplished through the DAC.

Mr. Koessel stated the City put boulders in both of his neighbors' yards, but he did not know whether the DAC was involved.

Committee Member Wiedower recommended Mr. Koessel follow the same avenue as his neighbors to try to obtain the necessary rocks and boulders.

Mr. Koessel stated his neighbor indicated it took a long time to get the City to come in and install the rocks. He discussed the drainage problems in his area. He said he was getting sink holes in his backyard. He discussed the difficulties some of his other neighbors were experiencing. He stated he hoped what was good for his neighbors would be good for him.

Committee Member Wiedower explained the DAC had limitations on what it could recommend, and if there were no public benefit it could not recommend spending Proposition 6 funds.

Mr. Koessel noted he was told by City Staff that a public policy was passed to help residents with flooding issues.

Mr. Wilson stated Mr. Koessel was correct; the policy was Proposition 6 from the 2018 bond program, and the Drainage Advisory Committee reviewed cases for Proposition 6; however, Proposition 6 funds could only be used on private property if there was a public benefit. He stated City Staff looked at the case and tried to find a public benefit for assisting Mr. Koessel, but a public benefit was not found.

Committee Member Wiedower suggested Mr. Koessel revisit his neighbors to see how his neighbors had obtained City Assistance and to pursue that route.

Mr. Koessel stated the City was supposed to keep up with the stormwater drainage but was not doing so when stormwater was eroding residents' yards.

Committee Member Parks discussed Mr. Koessel's property line. He stated if the sewer line was impacted by the erosion of the retaining wall, then there would be a public benefit, but it was not being impacted.

Mr. Wilson concurred.

Committee Member Amber Hamilton asked, since the DAC's hands were tied, was there somewhere Mr. Schwab could suggest Mr. Koessel go for help, either through another avenue with the City or the Army Corps of Engineers.

Assistant City Manager of Operations Kenny Schwab suggested he and Mr. Wilson go out and look at Mr. Koessel's property once again to better process the situation. He stated he

believed the statute said, “vested interest,” and the City interpreted this to mean a public benefit had to be defined in order to use public monies. He noted, as Committee Member Parks indicated, the sanitary sewer would have been a vested interest and he agreed right now the City did not have a vested interest. He said he would look at Mr. Koessel’s property and speak with Mr. Koessel’s neighbors.

Committee Member Parks noted Haikey Creek was a problem, and was not actually the City’s problem, but he believed the City would eventually need to step in to keep erosion down. He noted Mr. Koessel’s property was not public property.

Mr. Koessel noted his neighbors brought in dump truck loads of fill and he was told he could not do that.

Mr. Schwab explained Mr. Koessel would need to obtain a floodplain permit to bring dirt into a floodplain. He explained bringing in fill could worsen his neighbors’ situations or someone upstream. He explained it was not that Mr. Koessel could not bring in fill, it was just that Mr. Koessel needed to follow the proper procedures to do so. He stated he would get with the Engineering Team, come out to Mr. Koessel’s property and meet with the neighbors to see what occurred. He noted Mr. Koessel’s area was one of the few areas in which Broken Arrow owned part of Haikey Creek.

Mr. Koessel indicated Mr. Schwab was welcome to come out.

Mr. Schwab stated he agreed the DAC was not the right forum to help Mr. Koessel, but this did not mean there was not some other mechanism for assisting Mr. Koessel.

Chairperson Hendricks noted this erosion was taking place where the area narrowed. She asked how long the erosion had been taking place, how long had the wall been in place, and had the erosion increased due to construction elsewhere.

Mr. Koessel stated he could not answer these questions. He stated he moved into his home in 1998; his home was built in 1978 and the previous owners had installed the retaining wall. He noted when he moved in, the fence had just been moved from where the retaining wall was located a couple of feet closer to his home, and he just recently moved the fence up a couple more feet to escape the erosion. He stated his yard was eroding away.

Committee Member Hamilton asked if Mr. Koessel asked anyone else other than City Staff look into the situation.

Mr. Koessel responded in the negative.

Committee Member Hamilton suggested Mr. Koessel have an independent contractor come out and provide an estimate for what Mr. Koessel was asking and to share this with the City.

Mr. Koessel indicated he would do so.

Chairperson Hendricks thanked Mr. Koessel and noted Mr. Schwab would be in touch. She noted Mr. Koessel was welcome to revisit the Drainage Advisory Committee if it was discovered Mr. Koessel had a case, but at this time, the DAC could not approve Mr. Koessel’s application.

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Denise Mason.

**Move to deny Case No. 24-003 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye: 6 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori

Hendricks

**B. 24-560 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to NOT recommend to City Council to expend funds to mitigate drainage concerns at 519 South Redwood Avenue (Case No. 24-009)**

Mr. Wilson reported South Redwood Avenue was in the Union Station South subdivision which was platted in 1992; north of Houston and west of Olive. He stated this case was similar to Mr. Koessel's; there were sinkholes in a gentleman's backyard, there was a retaining wall, there was a sanitary sewer line running through the backyard, and this was in Olive Creek which drained into Haikey Creek. He displayed and discussed pictures of the yard, sinkholes, retaining wall, etc. He indicated the City Utility Department investigated and determined the sewer line had no leaks and there were no gaps in the system; the erosion was not negatively affecting the sewer line. He stated multiple investigations were conducted and it was determined there was no public benefit for this application. He noted there were some French drains. He discussed the erosion damage. He reiterated it was determined there would be no public benefit for repairing the retaining wall and, therefore, Staff recommended denial of this application.

Committee Member Parks asked where the sewer line was located.

Mr. Wilson indicated the sewer line was 5 or 6 feet west of the retaining wall. He stated he and Mr. Schwab walked along the back of the retaining wall and the photos he displayed were taken during this walk on site.

Chairperson Hendricks asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak regarding this issue; no one wished to speak.

Committee Member Parks asked if the applicant was familiar with City Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Wilson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Schwab stated this property owner reached out to the news, there was something on the news about six months ago, and the homeowner reached out to the City Council. He stated the homeowner used to work for the Army Corps of Engineers and was familiar with the Corps process. He indicated he walked the property a couple of times and tried to get access from the owner to the east who owned the floodplain, and the owner to the north, and never obtained access from the property owner to the east, so he was unable to go up and down the creek. He stated this was another railroad tie wall which did not hold up well to creek waters. He indicated he looked hard at how this could have a public benefit, but the sanitary sewer line was deep and upon videoing the line no dirt was found. He noted if there had been dirt in the line, he might have been able to find a public benefit.

Committee Member Wiedower noted there were many citizens in Broken Arrow who were having this type of issue. She asked if City Staff tried to help citizens find an avenue of assistance if the DAC could not help.

Mr. Schwab stated City Staff spent a lot of time with citizens who came forward for assistance with flooding or erosion. He noted 85 percent of the creeks in Broken Arrow were owned by the property owner who owned the home, or in this case the owner of the creek was the neighbor. He explained it became difficult when the homeowner owned the creek and most likely was unaware upon purchase of the home that the retaining wall was part of the property. He said most homeowners probably believed the City or the Corps owned the creek and retaining wall. He indicated the Corps only owned 15 percent of the creeks. He stated the City oversaw floodplain, the Corps monitored other things, while ownership was typically

the homeowner.

Vice Chair Mason asked if there were recommendations which could be made to homeowners, such as recommending homeowners bring in properly sized rip rap to help slow down erosion.

Mr. Schwab responded when the City met with a property owner, City Staff encouraged property owners to contact a private consultant regarding the issues. He explained if the City became a property owner's consultant and provided engineering advice, if something failed, then the City could be blamed. He noted the City would provide a list of consultants for homeowners to choose from to contact if they wished. He noted the City was willing to speak to whichever consultant or contractor a homeowner had spoken with.

Discussion ensued regarding the difficulty of these situations; not being able to bring in fill without contacting the City and the Corps first; and the problems with erosion along the creeks.

Committee Member Parks stated he believed a major expenditure by the City would be needed to begin to solve these problems.

Committee Member Wiedower stated perhaps the City could provide guidelines to anyone who wishes to purchase property and build near a creek to prevent future problems. She discussed an area near a creek which was turned into a park with native plants and butterfly gardens in Tulsa. She noted it was built to help with flooding. She stated she understood developers did not want to waste land which could be built upon, but it was important not to build a house on sandy soil where it would eventually fail.

Mr. Schwab explained Broken Arrow standards on drainage came in around 1994 and it evolved over the years. He stated many of the problems seen currently were built pre-1994. He stated the City joined the National Flood Insurance Program in 1983. He indicated a lot of discussion was being held regarding what to do moving forward.

Vice Chair Mason discussed the need for legislation which required developers to either build away from the creek or build a proper retaining wall which would stand the test of time; something to prevent these issues.

Mr. Schwab stated the City was in the process of updating subdivision regulations and this was a big talking point. He said the City was considering requiring a buffer zone around creeks. He noted there was a subdivision which put in a 50 foot buffer zone around the creek which cut through the subdivision and called it an erosion easement and it was highly effective.

Committee Member Parks noted retaining walls were great, but had to be effective, and a railroad tie retaining wall was not effective. He discussed his use of railroad ties over the years.

Vice Chair Mason discussed her unpleasant experiences with railroad ties.

Mr. Schwab stated City Staff would bring the drainage portion of the subdivision regulations before the Drainage Advisory Committee to allow the Committee to provide input.

MOTION: A motion was made by Donna Wiedower, seconded by Johnnie Parks.

**Move to deny Case No. 24-009 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye: 6 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori

Hendricks

**C. 24-561 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to recommend to City Council to expend funds to clean and repair an overgrown channel (Case No 24-004)**

Mr. Wilson reported this Item was in the Oak Crest third addition, platted in 1967, north of Washington Street and in between Elm and Lynn Lane. He displayed and discussed a map showing where this property was located. He noted there was an easement behind the house into which this drainage channel led. He displayed and discussed photos of the problem area. He stated to protect the drainage way it should be cleared, and bond language indicated clearing of drainage ways was permitted. He stated the public benefit would be to allow the water to flow unhindered into the City's detention system and prevent it from backing up underneath the pipe, underneath Richmond (a City road). He stated with all the property owners involved, the City would have to contact each and obtain permission to work on their property and this had not been done yet. He explained this was a recommendation for the clearing of the easement and to expend funds for the clearing, with the understanding that the City would have get permission from each homeowner whose lot the City had to access. He noted if only the first four residents agreed, then the first four residents' channels would be cleared, but the goal was to clear this channel all the way.

Council Member Parks asked about the property line in relation to the easement.

Mr. Wilson explained there was an easement through the area, but property lines extended to the middle of the easement.

The applicant, Randy Zogg, stated the property lines extended all the way across the easements, not just to the middle. He distributed photos of his property. He stated he was representing his entire street and all of his neighbors wished for this channel to be cleared.

Mr. Wilson stated one resident could ask on behalf of his neighbors, but the City was required to get written permission from each neighbor to proceed.

Mr. Zogg discussed the problems he and his neighbors were having.

Discussion ensued regarding the problems in the area, and obtaining permission from the neighbors before proceeding with the clearing of the channel.

Mr. Zogg stated any help would be appreciated.

Committee Member Wiedower noted if the City cleaned out the channel today, and the residents were not accustomed to keeping the channel clean afterward, it could be problematic. She stated perhaps the Committee, and the City needed a better solution.

Mr. Schwab stated this property already had an easement, so legally the City had access, but it would still obtain permission. He noted it was not really permission so much as notification as the City did have access with the easement. He explained once the channel was cleared the City would send a letter to the property owners indicating the property owner was required to maintain the channel in an acceptable manner. He stated an "acceptable manner" was defined by code and it would become a code enforcement action. He said technically today it was a code enforcement action, but it was big burden to place upon the property owners at this point; therefore, he agreed with the recommendation to clear the channel, get it into working order, and then follow up periodically with code enforcement.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if other channels had been identified by the City when called out for flooding issues.

Mr. Schwab stated the City looked at other channels, cleared other channels, and gone through code enforcement. He said Mr. Wilson's team oversaw code enforcement and was putting together an inventory of these properties to ensure the channels were periodically checked and properly maintained.

Committee Member Wiedower stated many of these property owners may not realize it was the property owner's responsibility to keep the channel clear.

Mr. Schwab agreed.

Committee Member Wiedower stated it might be money well spent to clear all the channels, educate the property owners, and then enforce the code. She said it was important that there be a long term benefit to clearing the channel, not just a short term benefit.

Mr. Schwab agreed.

Committee Member Parks asked about the public benefit of this case.

Mr. Schwab responded the public benefit would be to ease stormwater flow into the City's stormwater system with the clearing of the channel.

Chairperson Hendricks asked if any fences would need to be moved.

Mr. Zogg responded in the negative.

MOTION: A motion was made by Amber Hamilton, seconded by Johnnie Parks.

**Move to approve Case No. 24-004 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye: 6 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**D. 24-562 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to recommend to City Council to expend funds to design an updated outlet structure at 215 South Laurel Avenue (Case No. 24-005)**

Mr. Wilson reported West Commercial Court was located in the Stone Mill Bridge subdivision platted in 1995, north of Houston and east of Olive. He displayed and discussed a map of the area. He displayed and discussed photos of the problem area. He said City Staff was requesting design funds for erosion mitigation on the outfall. He stated the City had a couple of ideas on how to move forward but would hire an outside engineer to assist.

Committee Member Parks asked which direction the water flowed.

Mr. Wilson responded it flowed to the north into Haikey Creek which then flowed south.

Committee Member Wiedower asked about the pond.

Mr. Schwab stated the green pipe was installed by the City; the area got water all the way from Country Air Park by way of Dallas. He explained how the pond area came about and why the original design for the area did not get completed (one of the property owners had a dispute with the others). He said he would love to work with the current property owners to improve the area. He noted 11 feet per second was very fast flow and it needed to be slowed.

Discussion ensued regarding the water flow in and around the area; what existed on the surrounding properties including homes and vacant lots.

Mr. Schwab indicated he agreed with Staff's recommendation.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if Mr. Schwab expected a complete rehaul of the area would be necessary.

Mr. Schwab responded in the negative. He said if there was a way to move the water to the property on the west it would be ideal.

Mr. Wilson and Mr. Schwab displayed a map and discussed where the water currently flowed versus where the water was supposed to flow.

The applicant Sue Greekson discussed the issues with the water flow on her property.

MOTION: A motion was made by Donna Wallace, seconded by Donna Wiedower.

**Move to approve Case No. 24-005 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye: 6 -** Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**E. 24-563 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to recommend to City Council to expend funds to design erosion control measures along the bank of Haikey Creek at the Diocese of south Tulsa (Case No. 24-007)**

Mr. Wilson reported 91<sup>st</sup> Street (Washington Street) was recently reconstructed by the City of Broken Arrow. He stated the problem area was between Garnet and Olive. He displayed and discussed photos of the problem area noting the structure was a 4 cell, 10 x 15 foot, reinforced concrete box and all of this water was coming straight to the Diocese of Tulsa in Broken Arrow. He stated in 2021 the City tried to do a project at the tail end of the road widening project, but there had been no bidders. He noted the City would like to address the water coming through and underneath the City's roadway. He continued to discuss the photos and problems in the area. He said the City was seeking funds for a design to mitigate erosion on the bank. He noted the original plans were no longer applicable as over time the channel and bank had changed.

Committee Member Parks asked if the City had complaints from any other citizens regarding the footing and/or construction causing flooding.

Mr. Wilson responded in the negative. He indicated Staff had talks with the Diocese of Tulsa who were very willing to work with the City of Broken Arrow. He noted during the construction of the road, there were other issues with the soil being too loose and rebuilding was necessary, but this was outside of the right-of-way which was why the City needed Proposition 6 funds to design the project. He noted this was a part of Haikey Creek.

Vice Chair Mason stated she had watched this bank continue to erode and was not surprised to see this on the Agenda.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if the widening of the boxes done during the road widening would help to improve the water flow.

Mr. Wilson responded cleaning out the boxes underneath would help because velocity was a function of area. He explained what needed to be cleared outside of the boxes to open the area up for a better water flow which would slow down the velocity.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if there had been work done in the creek during the street widening.

Mr. Wilson explained only a little work was done in the creek; additional work was needed. He noted the clearing of the area could be done by City crews with notification to the Army Corps of Engineers. He explained the funds being requested would be to hire a design engineer to design rip rap or other mitigation.

Mr. Schwab explained the design engineer would design for the downstream portion of this area, while the City could handle the upstream side, perhaps with a contractor.

Vice Chair Mason asked if the house being constructed across the street from this property was affecting the stormwater drainage flow. She noted she was surprised anyone would build a home so close to the creek.

Mr. Wilson noted the property owner obtained a floodplain permit and was doing everything per City Ordinance and City criteria. He stated the property owner was not negatively impacting the area by building a home near the creek.

MOTION: A motion was made by Christi Gillespie, seconded by Johnnie Parks.

**Move to approve Case No. 24-007 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Christi Gillespie, Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**F. 24-564 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to recommend to City Council to expend funds to mitigate erosion and repair the north side of the Preserve Park Detention Pond (Case No. 24-008)**

Mr. Wilson reported Preserve Park was located west of 37<sup>th</sup> Street (209<sup>th</sup> Street) between 51<sup>st</sup> and 61<sup>st</sup>. He stated it was a newer park in the City of Broken Arrow. He displayed and discussed a map of the area, as well as photos of the area. He noted water erosion was damaging the trail around the pond in Preserve Park. He discussed the problems with erosion and gully formation in the area. He indicated the design for this project was complete.

Committee Member Parks asked about the outflow of the pond.

Mr. Wilson responded the outflow for the pond was into Adams Creek.

Committee Member Parks indicated he and his wife walked Preserve Park regularly and it did get dangerous on the north end. He asked where the private property was located. He stated the pond and the walkway belonged to the City.

Mr. Wilson explained the majority of this project would be done on public land; there was a small portion of property on the north side for which the City would be required to obtain an easement for construction.

Chairperson Hendricks asked if Mr. Wilson had spoken with the property owner.

Mr. Wilson responded in the affirmative; the property owner was willing to work with the City.

Committee Member Gillespie asked why there were problems with this Park as it was just built.

Mr. Wilson explained there had been much more concentrated flow onto this property than it was originally designed for. He noted during construction the City placed additional fill on the property to the north and there were a few developments developed upstream which contributed to the water flow. He stated the City noticed some irregularities in some of the

developments and was working with the developers to have these irregularities corrected.

Committee Member Wiedower asked who designed the Park.

Mr. Wilson responded an outside consultant designed the Park.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if the changes to the surrounding area with the developments were causing the erosion.

Mr. Wilson responded in the affirmative; a good portion of the erosion was caused by the surrounding area development.

Discussion ensued regarding the development in the surrounding area; how the development affected the Preserve Park; the future development of the property to the north of the Preserve Park; the fill from the pond being moved to the property to the north contributing to the erosion of the Park; and the Preserve Park pond being a regional detention pond.

Mr. Schwab explained the City acquired the property where Preserve Park was located from the developer to the north and as part of the agreement of acquirement the developer owned the dirt (dug up to create the pond) and the City was required to place the dirt on the property to the north of the Park.

Vice Chair Mason asked if the developer's consultant designed the pond.

Mr. Schwab responded the City hired the developer's consultant to design Preserve Park.

Vice Chair Mason stated the consultant should have been aware of the dirt being placed on the property to the north and should have made accommodations for it.

Mr. Schwab agreed, noting the City was still talking with the consultant about it.

Committee Member Wiedower asked if the incoming development would negatively impact the Preserve Park.

Mr. Schwab indicated the future development was taken into consideration by the consultant during the Park's design.

Discussion ensued regarding how the development would affect Preserve Park.

Committee Member Gillespie said she felt Preserve Park must have been poorly designed for these problems to be occurring.

Committee Member Parks stated \$325,000 dollars was a lot of money to spend on a new project.

Committee Member Gillespie agreed, especially if it was due to a poor design.

Mr. Schwab stated City Staff took the position that this needed to get fixed sooner rather than later, otherwise, it would go up in costs. He said City Staff had no problem pursuing efforts through the Legal Department to be repaid and intended to do so.

Committee Member Gillespie and Committee Member Parks agreed the City should pursue repayment.

MOTION: A motion was made by Denise Mason, seconded by Donna Wallace.

**Move to approve Case No. 24-008 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Christi Gillespie, Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**G. 24-565 Consideration, discussion, and possible action to recommend to City Council to expend funds to construct storm sewer on Dallas Street between 2nd Street and Haskell Park and repair adjacent properties (Case No. 24-010)**

Mr. Wilson reported this was on Dallas Street, north of Houston, between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> streets. He displayed and discussed a map showing where this was located. He noted this was brought before the Committee in March 2023 to request design funds. He said since that time the design was completed; there were a couple of small technical things still being worked through, but the project could be put out to bid today. He discussed the water flow in the area. He displayed and discussed photos of the problem area and inside the storm sewer. He stated he was not asking for the full construction amount. He noted the project would increase capacity of the storm sewer from a 30 inch pipe to a 36 inch pipe which would improve stormwater conveyance in the area. He indicated the public benefit was to replace the existing deteriorating storm sewer and mitigate concerns on private property. He noted most of this project would be on public property, but some would cross over onto private property and there was no easement at this time. He said City Staff would like to move forward and asked for approval.

Committee Member Gillespie noted she spoke with two of the homeowners involved in this case. She noted just stepping onto the lawn of one of the homeowners she sank up to her knees and the driveway was completely caved in. She stated the homeowner was upset, but she was surprised the homeowner had never reached out to City Council.

Mr. Wilson stated the homeowners contacted City Staff who were working with the homeowners for this design.

Committee Member Gillespie stated it was important to go out and see some of these cases. She noted this was the worst case she had seen. She said she was worried someone would get hurt.

Mr. Schwab agreed.

MOTION: A motion was made by Christi Gillespie, seconded by Denise Mason.

**Move to approve Case No. 24-010 per Staff recommendations**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Christi Gillespie, Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:33p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Donna Wallace.

**Move to adjourn**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Christi Gillespie, Amber Hamilton, Johnnie Parks, Donna Wallace, Donna Wiedower, Denise Mason, Lori Hendricks

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lori Hendricks, Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Blackford, Deputy City Clerk