

# Stormwater Management Committee



Minutes of Wednesday, September 29, 2010

7:30 A.M.-Leawood City Hall-Main Conference Room

## Committee Members present:

Councilmember Cain

Pat Dunn

Councilmember Filla

John Kahl

Mike Levitan

Councilmember Rawlings (Chair)

Alec Weinberg

## Committee Members absent:

Councilmember Bussing

Skip Johnson

Carole Lechevin

## Staff present:

Joe Johnson

David Ley

Julie Stasi

## Guests: (by order of sign in sheet)

Amy Sokoloff, 3200 W 81<sup>st</sup> Terrace, Leawood, KS 66206

Tami Faris, 3021 W 81<sup>st</sup> Terrace, Leawood, KS 66206

Marthe Tamblyn, 3020 W 81<sup>st</sup> Terrace, Leawood, KS 66206

Bob Zyck, 8710 Ensley Lane, Leawood, KS 66206

**Chair Jim Rawlings called the meeting to order at 7:30 AM. Committee, Staff and Guests in attendance introduced themselves.**

## **TOPIC OF DISCUSSION: MINUTES OF PAST MEETING**

- Committee Member Alec Weinberg made a motion to approve the August 25, 2010 Minutes. Motion seconded by Committee Member John Kahl. Motion passed with all members present in favor.

## **TOPIC OF DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding stormsewer work in the Leawood Heritage Subdivision (87<sup>th</sup> & Cherokee area).**

Joe Johnson advised at the last meeting, it was the decision of the committee not to move forward with enclosing the existing concrete lined channel. The Committee did direct staff to look at the possibility of

replacing the culverts at either end of the concrete lined channel eliminating the street flooding. Staff also looked at reconstructing the existing concrete lined channel changing the cross section from trapezoidal to a U-shaped channel. Phelps Engineers were hired to look at these alternatives and the impact to the adjacent properties and street. The bottom line for replacing the existing boxes with larger ones does not prevent the street from flooding. Additional downstream improvements are needed at each end to keep the roads from flooding.

The recommendation that Phelps had was to place an open lined channel and that the house at 8701 Ensley Lane be purchased (Pitts/Mason Residence). Their reasoning is the current channel constricts the flow of water and any improvements are going to be right adjacent to the foundation. The house sits within twelve feet from the top of the box.

Flooding will not be eliminated on the street unless additional channel improvements downstream are made from the two boxes. Just doing channel improvements, will not change anything because there will still be constrictions at the 2 culverts.

In removing the house, there is not enough room for detention, but we would have the options of how we want to align the channel. We spoke yesterday that if you realigned the channel and straightened it out, was this land what we really want? There is not much to do with the property. We could talk to the neighbors on either side and see if they would be willing to deed the property over to them on either side of the channel and then have the City just maintain the channel. There are a few options to the channel improvements that can be done. Probably we would want to do a concrete lined channel as a natural channel would result in high erosion.

Bob Zyck is concerned that if the water cannot get under the road, it goes up two feet and there is flooding. In 1998 it went over the road and the water swept the railroad ties out. Mr. Zyck shows the committee pictures of the creek when it is not even raining and the erosion damage in his yard. This water moves like a freight train, taking boulders and everything with it. If it hits you in your calves, it will knock you down and you're a dead man. It's very, very dangerous, it hits the road and it rises. Mr. Zyck's concern is that in just a steady rain where we've had four inches, it's bad. If we get more there could be a major event easily. The other concern is now that we've improved 87<sup>th</sup> street, there is just a fraction of a little bit more of water coming straight into the channel. With a flash flood, it only will increase the chance of a flash flood event like in the past. We do have a safety issue. He does not have a problem if the water can get under the road and can be designed to do that.

Committee asked again what the home owners thoughts were about the City buying the home.

Staff advised that the resident had said if that was an option, we could talk; however they are opposed to doing any channel improvements.

John Kahl asked if it would be eligible for County participation and is it currently on the list.

Joe Johnson said we wouldn't move forward until...It is eligible to be funded under SMAC and the other question is at what time in the next couple of years would the City have its matching funds. That will drive it more than getting a date to be funded by the County. When will we have our matching share?

Joe Johnson thinks if it gets on the list, it would probably be ranked very high in priority considering everything. If we improve the boxes and do a concrete lined channel, it will have an effect on 7 homes. Between flooding the roads and taking 7 homes out of the flood plain, I think the ratio would be high enough it would rank high within the top 15 projects.

John Kahl- Do we know (in any of these options we are looking at) if they don't bring everyone up to the 100% standard is the county willing to participate in those kinds of projects?

Joe Johnson-they are. We have done a project like that. To get all of them out of the flood plain, it could make a 5 million dollar project 15 million dollars. As long as we see good economics and exhaust other possibilities.

John Kahl-Does that then exempt it from future participation?

Joe Johnson-Yes, pretty much. If we come in and improve it and do all the improvements and provide flood protection, the county wouldn't refund it again; and I wouldn't go back and ask them. Going in again would be a major reconstruction. You would want to address it now. An adjustment now would be pennies on the dollar compared to going back and doing another new project.

John Kahl-Under Phelps Option #8 in their super critical flow regime, by Zyck's property...Do we know that a triple 8 x 6 cell box to replace an existing double 7 x 5, my question is: Is the restriction requirement for supercritical flow, having to do more with the box structure or with the downstream channel?

Joe Johnson-the Channel. Eliminating the house: if we are going to go in and do a project from upstream to downstream, we would figure out what we need to do downstream, so it doesn't make any difference what the flow regime is. The house is out of the flood plain.

John Kahl-We do not have the costs. Right? It seems like staff would probably recommend Option 8. Sounds to me like if we move forward with that kind of an option, even if the engineers estimate that we have right now is accurate for the proposed improvements, it sounds like what would actually be recommended to be constructed might be more substantial than that.

Joe Johnson-That would provide the most flood protection at the least cost. Their cost estimate to replace the boxes upstream and do the channel improvement is a little over 1.7 million dollars.

~ Option 8 is to keep all the homes in place, replace the two boxes upstream and downstream and redo the concrete lined channel. 1.7 million dollars.

~ Option of just doing the boxes by themselves on both sides we are at \$888,000; although that does not really do anything. You have better capacity under the road, but we are still flooding the road.

Member Filla-So doing the roads without the culvert doesn't do it. Doing the culvert without the road doesn't do it. And there is no need to buy the Pitts house if you do the roads and the culverts for 1.7. Johnson-We always have the option and we would still look at that option of what is the best way to get the water downstream once you get on the other side of Cherokee and Ensley Lane. A perfect fix would be around 2 million dollars.

John Kahl-It sounds like whatever we recommend, it's several years out. Normally when items like this are brought to the Committee it's an eminent project and we recommend moving forward or not, but in this particular case it sounds like it's more a situation of- we have a problem, we probably could do something down here, but it's 3 to 5 years off anyway so what is our consideration right now?

Joe Johnson-We had a public meeting with a majority of the property owners to review what we found out in a flood study and options that were available to control the flooding. In the public meeting there seemed to be an overwhelming consensus and they wanted to do a project. In that project they wanted to enclose the entire channel which is a 5 million dollar project.

At the stormwater committee meeting, it was a 180. We had about 50/50 of the residents there wanting or not wanting the project. The committee at that point said there is enough opposition then we are not going to look at enclosing the channel but we need to take a look at if we can improve the boxes under the street and eliminate the road flooding. The answer to that question, is No, you can't do it just by doing the boxes.

If you want to get rid of the street flooding and improve the safety of the streets you have to do more improvements than just replacing the existing boxes.

Debra Filla-Part of the momentum swing was that Mrs. Pitts and her neighbor both were saying by doing this project we would be destroying the value of their property because (especially the Pitts house) sits so close to the easement that we would have the channel right by them.

Joe Johnson-Yes at that time we were looking at taking a fairly wide box and widening out a lot more. If you just replace the channel that impact would be less.

Alec Weinberg-On the process of going to the County, do you have to have the easements before going to them?

Johnson-No.

Weinberg-So you really do not have to have a buy in from the neighbors before you go into the queue. But before the project starts you have to have the easements.

Johnson-Generally the process has been on a project that is funded through SMAC and the City, the expectation is the easements are dedicated to us. If we do not get 100% dedication, then we go to condemnation and we just condemn them all and then create a benefit district and access the cost of the easements back to those properties that we had to get easements from. The channel is only 17' at the top so we have a lot of room to work inside of that. We are only going to go out about three or four feet wider from the top of the channel.

Member Filla-What flexibility do we get on the entire project by removing the house at 8701 Ensley?

Johnson-Buying out that house has an impact on 8710 Ensley; flood protection. It has no impact on anybody else. The estimate on the house was \$525,000 for a buyout. And that was just the engineer's estimate. The house has not been flooded.

Member Filla-So basically changing it doesn't save any costs as to how you put in the box or what you do with the street, it would be the same whether the house is there or not.

Pat Dunn-Has had the privilege to be involved in some of these projects directly when he was on the Council and sometime during that period of time it was the Council's conclusion that when we had these projects that are really for property protection, that if we don't have complete buy in then we are not going to fight with people to help them help themselves. So then the issue becomes one of is there truly a safety issue or not because that is the only basis upon which the Council was willing to proceed with the project- if there is significant opposition.

As a result of that, at the last meeting this Committee asked: Is there a simple way to address the safety issue without having to get into the fight with the folks who are opposed to doing the project? What he is hearing is that, "No, there is not." So the issue before us is: Is the safety issue of a significant enough nature that we feel comfortable as a Committee recommending that the Council have staff go forward with plans to address the safety issue in the least impactful way to the neighborhood.

He does know from the report that they said two roadway drainage structures are undersized with greater than 7" of overtopping of the residential roadway; which is a violation of the City's stormwater design criteria, APWA 5600. That sounds ominous and he doesn't know if a violation of the stormwater criteria is the same as a determination that there truly is a safety issue. Do we have criteria that we utilize to determine whether there is a true safety issue somewhere?

Joe Johnson-The APWA standards have evolved over 50 years. On new construction when we look at roads crossing channels of any sort we size the culvert so that in a 100 year event, the flooding of the road is no more than 7 inches at the curb 4 inches at the crown of the street, that way you maintain access for cars and emergency vehicles such as police and fire. When we look at the standard that was built to, that in a low area, there is 1.4 to 1.9 feet of water.

Pat Dunn-Does that mean it's now established as a fact that we have a safety issue there?

Joe Johnson-Yes. If you were talking to Police and Fire, they would say yes we have difficulties getting through that location in a 100 year event.

Pat Dunn-So do we have a lot of discretion then about whether to deal with the safety issue or not? His recollection is that if there is a true safety issue then we need to do something.

John Kahl-well the City has a potential liability. But as long as the City doesn't...This was apparently built according to the standard of the day, but the way he understands the way law work, is as long as the City doesn't come back in and do anything, they are not liable for it if the standards change. But if the City comes in and does anything to this, if they don't bring it up to the current standard for safety and then someone gets hurt, then the City would be liable. So we move forward with some sort of a project and leave the flooding condition on the road and someone drives across, gets washed downstream, drowns and dies, then the City would be potentially liable for that death and that could be quite expensive. Not to mention sad. If you are going to do something, you've got to bring it up to standard because otherwise you are opening itself up to massive liability.

Debra Filla-going back to the public safety issue. Can I get to everyone's house with Police and Fire? She hasn't seen a house you can't get to because you can come to them from one angle or another. Is that correct?

John Kahl and staff point out houses on Cherokee Court (8730, 8732, 8736, and 8738) that you cannot get to; because that area is flooded over the road.

Joe Johnson-1.9 feet and it would stay that way 15-20 minutes, 30 minutes, once it gets to that level, depending on the storm duration.

Chair Rawlings-If this were eligible for SMAC, we would ask for the County (they would provide 75%), so at a 2 million dollar project at the minimum, the City would be looking at \$500,000 in today's dollars. And this could be five years down the road? Plus any easements, which are the City's sole cost.

Coming back to the lake issue, (as she believes that other Homes Association will be coming back in November on what they want to propose): Debra Filla learned that once a lake is full it is equal to any pervious service. So really changing what is going on at the lake isn't a factor in terms of alternative.

Joe Johnson-No to have an impact on the lake you would have to actually build the damn up on the downstream side for it to hold more water. The problem you have with that is as the lake gets deeper, it gets closer to the homes. There are some homes that from the last meeting, owners said last time the water got within 15 feet of the back of their house. So if you raise the lake up a foot, the water would be in the house. That is the balance the lake folks have is that they do not have a lot of storage capacity or for us to say, hey we want to do some improvements to your lake.

Member Filla-Unless you drudge it may be deeper?

Group-No, it's still full, it will not take any additional volume.

Patt Dunn-unless you put a drain in the bottom to China.

Chair Rawlings asks Joe if we didn't have this Stormwater Committee does he have a recommendation that he would bring forward? Is there a long term fix we should consider? Considering the amount of money and the budget? Give us your thoughts.

Joe Johnson-Based on the studies and it's not any different than what we've got on other projects that we've approved. Right down from here new the area at 86<sup>th</sup> & Overhill we had the same thing. We had several feet of water going over Overhill and we put in a triple cell box. And we added a few downstream improvements to make sure that no one flooded. It wasn't a real popular project, but every time it rained, we were closing Overhill.

Pat Dunn-This is what he is struggling with in this. He is not seeing any difference between this and other projects we have made decisions on based on the public safety issue.

Joe Johnson-If we ask whether the street is passable, then yes the answer is let's move forward with Option 8...you have to do both of them. Do you do the project at the upstream end and take care of the flooding in the street or what. It's the only way to stop the flooding in the street; to build a box past the back corner of the house. The property owner is concerned with the side entry garage and drive they would not be able to access their home. That could be minimized as far as getting in and out of the house and the property would be taken out of the flood zone.

Then we need to figure out whether we buy out the house and realign the channel at the downstream location. We could always talk with the folks to see what we need to do to improve the flooding of the other two property owners. It will not be a small project. At the most we are looking at 2 million dollars if you do everything. We would sit down with Phelps Engineering and look at the option and what we need to do and submit a plan to the county. Then we would come back to the Council and say here is where we are at and the estimated costs and then make a final submittal to the county. The City would do the project at the time the City had its matching share. So if its 2013 or 2014; it's whenever that share is available.

John Kahl-Does this committee need to make a recommendation for that modification to the SMAC/CIP to occur?

Joe Johnson-Yes and we need a recommendation to define those options in fine detail that we have available for the fix.

**John Kahl-Moved to recommend to the City Council that staff modify the scope of this project to address public safety issues and get those modifications reflected upon the SMAC/CIP for potential funding in a future date.**

**Pat Dunn-Seconds the Motion.**

**All present members were in favor. Motion passed.**

Joe Johnson-We will focus on the flooding of the streets and what those issues are and take a look at what can be done between the streets and the two boxes and we'll see what we can do at each end to make it passable. We can then come back with those details on what we can do downstream and upstream. Then we may have a final recommendation on which option we want to go with.

Member Filla-One comment before we go to the next one. We have 5 million dollars worth of back-log stormwater projects and we are now spending \$600,000 every other year because of budget constraints. So to be putting a project of \$500,000 on the table to be funded by us, gives you a perspective of the challenge that we'll have, even if we get SMAC funds. We'll have to look down the road and see where are we going to get the funding? That's a mill levy increase.

### **TOPIC OF DISCUSSION: STORM SEWER SYSTEM AT 3200 W 81<sup>ST</sup> TERRACE**

Joe Johnson-Back in 2001 we had some interest in redoing the existing storm system in this area. It does not meet our design standards and does not take water as efficiently as with our new standards. We looked at replacing the line that is north of 81<sup>st</sup> Terrace (basically on the Leawood/Prairie Village border). Some residents had asked the City to look at doing storm drain improvements and we looked at it and determined we could upgrade the line to today's standards in taking more drainage. The cost to replace this section is estimated today at \$255,000. The problem was when we got done with the design, we only had a couple of folks that would give the required easements and the rest said we're fine, leave us alone. So we didn't move forward with the project.

Amy Sokoloff-Said this was her first experience with any City Committee and wanted to compliment

Debra Filla and this whole process. It has been attentive and efficient and friendly and workable, so thank you for a making this a good experience. Ms. Sokoloff described her property on the map and advised she has lived here just a couple of months. Shows a drain in her neighbors yard, and clearly there were water issues in 2001 before she took ownership of the house, they had a huge rain and the property did flood. The previous owners replaced all the carpeting and padding, however the damage to the sheetrock is now her expense. She moved into the property and two weeks later they had another water event. One drain totally overflows, coming right up to her patio, her boxwoods are flooded. About a foot and a half and water streams down and then into her house. She is concerned about it flooding again. Ms. Sokoloff did receive a letter from the City's Engineer Michelle Sherry about the 2012 improvements planned to their street. That is great and wondered if there was a creative way to while the street is being improved to at the same time while the equipment and staff are already there do the storm drain upgrade.

John Kahl-Quick question to verify the flooding before you bought the house. Was the flooding due to basement flooding with the sewer or overland flow?

Ms. Sokoloff advised it was from overland flow, not sanitary sewer. It was stormwater. The water came in the back door to her patio. There is a water mark on the door and it forced the door open and then went down to the basement. Flooding into the home and the street became an issue.

Marthe Tamblin-Lives next door to Ms. Sokoloff. Advised the water comes across the back yard at the Sokoloff property- pushing railroad ties and then comes in between the two homes. They call this "the river" when it rains hard. The water rushes and then the other drains can't handle it and the street floods. People at the end of the cul-de-sac can't get across. The water also rushes into another neighbor's garage at 3021.

Tami Faris-It is like a 7 foot river. When it rains hard it goes through the back yard and goes down. They purchased their house a couple months ago. It flooded when it was under contract. It came in through the garage. Thinks there is more water that backs up into their driveway, comes up the drive and into the garage. They've pulled up carpet and believe it's happened before and was not disclosed to them. There are rocks in the back yard that are big rocks like a river bed all through the back yard and obviously this has been occurring for many years. She knows her neighbor is not for anything being done as it will disrupt her life too much.

Marthe Tamblin-There are three properties that have changed ownership since 2001 that she is aware of.

Tami Faris-Thinks the property owner before her was not for it, but they (the Farris's) are so for it. They have a 5 year old child that they do not want to have washed away.

Chair Rawlings-Asked Joe if the recommended improvements would solve their issues? Short of a 500 year event?

Joe Johnson-Advised yes, we would go in and build the standard of a 10 year event with swales to carry the rest of the overland flow.

John Kahl-Could their problem be helped just by doing the inlets and not the pipe system?

Joe Johnson-No. We need to do a lot of grading. From the discussion, they have been getting a lot of overland flow. Ten acres in Prairie Village all flow down. It's not like it's in a storm sewer and it's trying to catch up. The structures that are built are really inefficient and trying to get that water in....

We would replace existing storm sewer line. When we do the street project, we will replace the inlets and the pipe, but we do not have money to go up further. The program is typically a 2 ½ million dollar program and in 2012 the amount we have to work with is 1.25 million. I can't do 82<sup>nd</sup> Terrace as it was kicked off the list, so there is no money to do the storm sewer improvements with the street. There is money in the street program to fix the curb inlets and we'll size them appropriately so whenever we have the ability to come back in and improve the rest of it that will be in place. When we do the streets in 2012 we'll do part of it but we do not have enough funds to do the stormsewer. Yes, the time to do it would be in 2012 when we have the street torn up, but there is another \$200,000 that would have to be made available. There is a lot of grading that must be done. Does not even know if there is a swale out there, but you have to make it so the water gets to the inlets.

John Kahl-Do we know how much more extensive is the storm sewer extending into Prairie Village?

David Ley-Our map is just what our staff has surveyed. It may extend further.

John Kahl-Due to budgetary constraints and a number of other factors even if this was something that we thought was a relatively high priority, it's at least a couple of years away and maybe 4 or 5 years away from really being able to go in and address this problem? Yet at the same time, they have eminent issues that are causing them challenges and difficulties which I can certainly sympathize with. My question is: Is there anything that we can do short of replacing the pipe system at this point? Via grading and swale and that sort of thing that if we had the cooperation of the property owner might not be nearly as expensive, to at least help some with the problem? Or?

David Ley-Like you said before, if we go in and do not do our current standards, we are setting ourselves up for a lawsuit.

John Kahl-Just looking at it as if I was living there. We all say there is a problem, that's a bummer. So I flood every time it rains and say yea, sorry I don't have any money I can't fix it. The property owner really can't fix it. Their hands are tied because there is nothing they can do purely on their own property to address the problem.

Joe Johnson-If there is interest now in doing it, let's get the easements now and then when funding is available we will be ready.

David Ley-We are surveying this area, we are doing the street and we are going to survey the storm sewer line so we know exactly where the pipes are going to be and grading will have to be and what needs to be done.

Pat Dunn-So if you have the easements in place, then it is just a funding issue.

**Pat Dunn-Makes a Motion that we recommend to Council that staff be authorized to proceed with obtaining easements for a potential project.**

**Debra Filla seconds the Motion. All members present were in favor. Motion passed.**

Joe was asked about the timing and the funding.

Joe Johnson-Generally this program (the Reconstruction program) was a 2.5 million dollar program and it's been cut to 1.25. The time to do it is when we are doing the street. The easiest way to do it is to increase the cap on the dollar amount for the reconstruction program to include the cost of the stormsewer. This probably would need to happen now so it can be put in the resolution to have the funding in there if it all worked out.

**Member Filla makes a Motion that we recommend to Council to increase the funding of the 2012 Residential Street Reconstruction Program to include the storm sewer.**

John Kahl-has a question real quick-Obviously, we at the stormwater committee are not fully aware nor do we necessarily participate in the overall budgeting that the City Council does. So we can look at something and say, yea, it's a priority and that's a problem, fix it. Spend it, but we don't realize that that means now we can't do this street project or another stormsewer project will get bumped etc. These kinds of decisions have a lot of repercussions. He is willing to approve the motion Debra just made but fully recognizing that there are probably bigger budgetary issues and he guesses he will pass the buck and say it's the City Council's problem to figure out how they are going to handle it.

**John Kahl seconds the Motion.**

**All members present were in favor, Motion passed.**

Debra Filla asked, that if she was a citizen and had flooding in her back yard and she learns that it's 2 years before the City can come in and create a swale, how would she know if she does some landscaping or choose to put in a swale to fit into the plan. How would she know?

Joe Johnson-sure, well they could. In this area, his guess is everything sheet-flows down. The best they could do would be to crown the yard. (Joe gave some tips on how the yard could be graded and what they would do when the City could get out there). We will have to take a look at the water and how it comes down and figure out how to get it to the storm sewer.

Amy Sokoloff -Appreciates the information, but as a home owner, she is afraid to do any sizable landscaping that might adversely affect the Tamblins and does not want to increase any water on their property, just to get it out of her yard; as that would not help the community.

John Kahl-We have been dealing with a number of issues the last several meetings, and the subject matter repeatedly comes up that--What was it, we had \$200,000 a year? And now it's \$100,000 a year? What is the City's current commitment to stormwater projects-are we still going at \$200,000 a year?

Joe Johnson-We have \$600,000 that has been committed to the City's improving its own failed infrastructure.

John Kahl-Did I not hear that that has been more recently reduced? At least in current years?

Joe Johnson-Well, there were two funds. There was the 1/8 cent sales tax; which is to pay for projects similar to this (non approved SMAC projects). Then we have an accelerated storm water program that was funded at a million dollars a year for five (5) years. And when the economy did what it did, that went away and we went from a million to \$600,000 and then we went to \$600,000 every other year. Now what's happening is we are taking the share of the 1/8 cent sales tax at \$600,000, so we kind of lost all the funding we had for projects like this and the 1/8 cent sales tax money is now used to fund our 5 million dollar infrastructure that has failed. So we moved money around.

John Kahl-So the \$600,000 a year is coming from the sales tax, is that correct?

Joe Johnson-Yes.

John Kahl-So at that rate, how far out are we? Before we can conceivably think that we've made headway on these issues are they 5 years? 10 years?

Joe Johnson-\$35 million divided by \$600,000.

John Kahl-So, a long time...a long time.

Chair Rawlings-70 years.

John Kahl-I don't know what the answer is or what the solution is and now we're talking revenues and changing tax structures and whatever else, but obviously we have several City council people here on this Committee, and I do not necessarily want to make a motion or anything like that, but you know, we're behind the eight ball here and the problems getting worse. I think some serious consideration needs to be made towards at least investigating other funding sources or revenue sources or something. And try to get a handle on this problem in less than 70 years.

Joe Johnson-Advised that in November the Council has a work session to talk about stormwater utilities and a funding mechanism to help.

John Kahl-Good, because these people have a problem. And the City has some degree of responsibility to try to address that. We've talked about that, we're going to try to fix that-but. They are fortunate in that maybe they can get some funding in 2 or 3 years. Some of these folks are looking at saying, geeze my grandkids are going to be retiring before the City has enough money to pay for this. Their problems may be of no less eminent. Somehow or other we need to find a way to try to address these problems in a more timely fashion. Glad to hear that there is a work session scheduled to at least begin to investigate those options.

**The meeting adjourned at 8:54 AM.** Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department

Olympus Recording DS300110