

MINUTES



INGRAM CITY COUNCIL
October 20, 2025
Ingram City Hall
230 Highway 39, Ingram TX 78025
Regular Council Meeting

The meeting facility is wheelchair accessible and accessible parking spaces are provided. Requests for accommodation or interpretative services must be made to the City Secretary 48 hours prior to this meeting. Please contact the City Secretary's office at 830- 367-5115 for further information.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Claud Jordan at 6:03 PM

ROLL CALL

Mayor Claud Jordan called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Council Members Present:

- Rocky Hawkins
- Ray Howard
- Christopher McLachlan
- David [last name inaudible]
- Robert [last name inaudible]

Council Members Absent:

- None

Quorum was present.

City Staff Present (as identified in the audio):

- City Secretary: Bryanne (Bryanne) Doss
- Code Enforcement / Floodplain / Building: Stuart Gross
- Police Department: Chief/Officer Dustin Breshears (identified as Dustin)

INVOCATION / PRAYER

Councilmember Ray Howard offered an opening prayer asking for guidance in conducting the city's business and for the safety of citizens.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

None

2. VISITORS / CITIZENS FORUM

A member of the public may address the City Council regarding any item on this agenda. Comments must be relevant to the agenda item. This is not intended to be a question-and-answer session. Prior to speaking, each speaker must fill out the speaker request form and submit it to the City Secretary before the meeting is called to order. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.

A. Citizen – Shelly (Speed Bumps & Dog Barking)

Speaker: “Shelly” [last name not clearly stated]

Topic: Speed Bumps and Animal Nuisance

1. Speed Bumps – Cypress Falls Drive & River Park Area

Requested **speed bumps** on: **Cypress Falls Drive**; and **River Park** (referred to as the street behind her residence). Stated those road segments are **long, straight** stretches and used by:

Cars, trucks, motorcycles, and even small motorcycles driven by kids. Reported **chronic speeding**, particularly on Sundays, well above posted limits (she mentioned speeds exceeding 20–25 mph). Expressed concerns that:

- It is “just a matter of time” before a **child or dog is hit**.
- Offered **video recordings** of speeding vehicles and near-crashes for city review.

2. Dog Barking / Nuisance

Reported being “in the middle of a whirlwind” of barking dogs around her house, with dogs barking “every minute” and causing ongoing disturbance.

3. Staff / Council Response:

- Speed Bump:
- Mayor Jordan stated: The speed bump request can be placed on a future agenda for council consideration and vote.
- For the **barking dog** issue:
 - Stuart Gross explained they are waiting on the Chief’s return before proceeding on certain enforcement steps.
 - Mayor instructed Stuart to provide Shelly with his contact information so she can coordinate directly.
 - Shelly indicated she would skip two other items she had initially listed and follow up with Stuart instead.

ACTION: None

- No formal motion on speed bumps or dog barking at this meeting.
- Direction: Staff (Stuart) to follow up with Shelly regarding barking dogs.
- Speed bumps to be placed on a future agenda for discussion and possible action.

B. Citizen – Henry Dangle (RV Ban / Floodway Concerns)

Speaker: Henry Dangle

Topic: Concerns regarding proposed RV ban in the floodway / changes to flood damage prevention ordinance.

- A. Stated that no one from the city had come to speak directly with the Riverside RV Park residents about safety concerns, How safe residents feel, or their views on proposed changes.
- B. Shared his July 4 flood experience:
 - Had moved into the park roughly one month before the flood.
 - Stayed up with the volunteer fire department, watching the river from around 1:30 a.m.–4:00 a.m. No one present anticipated a “35-foot wall of water” arriving suddenly; the river rose like a tidal wave, overwhelming even centuries-old cypress trees.
 - Described the event as a “once-in-a-lifetime” flood. Noted that: Everyone in his RV park survived and no one was injured.
- C. Most RVs remained salvageable; his own RV was flooded about 2.5 feet inside but was cleaned and is still in use.
- D. Argued that RV parks differ from mobile home parks because RVs are mobile; with sirens or early warnings, residents can hook up and leave quickly (e.g., “10 minutes and I’m out of there”).
- E. The city is being “reactionary” by banning or closing RV parks based on a single extreme event, instead of: Implementing warning systems (sirens, etc.), and Improving preparedness

Requested that council:

- Table the vote on any RV ban in the floodway,
- Conduct additional research on safety measures, and
- Consider ways to improve safety without forcing closure or displacement.

Council Response:

- Mayor and council listened; no immediate vote on the ordinance occurred during Henry's remarks.
- Discussion of the ordinance occurred later under Item 8 – Revised Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (see below).

C. Citizen – Tim Jones (Variance / Workforce Housing)

Speaker: Tim Jones

Topic: Tim Jones addressed the council during the Citizens Forum regarding a previously discussed variance request at 201 and 203 Ingram Loop. Follow-up from prior meeting concerning a variance to accommodate construction of two single-family homes.

- Seeks to build two single-family homes of approximately 1,200–1,300 sq. ft. each.
- Stated that recent changes to variances and deed restrictions make it difficult to build: “Good design, quality” smaller homes on these lots. Emphasized goal is workforce housing: Target sale prices under \$300,000, Aim to serve local families/workforce rather than investors.
- Parking Concern (from previous meeting):
 - Prior concern: potential for residents or visitors to park in the utility road easement.
 - Tim presented a plat/plot plan showing three on-site parking spaces.
 - Stated he found no explicit Ingram ordinance specifying a minimum number of spaces per single-family dwelling.
 - Referenced City of Kerrville standards:
 - Two spaces per single-family dwelling,
 - Argued his plan with three spaces meets or exceeds that guideline.

REQUESTED:

- That his variance request be moved forward at the next council meeting for a vote.
- Council / Staff Response:
- Acknowledged that the matter cannot be voted on at this meeting.
- No council questions were raised on the record.

ACTION: None

- No vote on variance at this meeting.
- Expectation that staff will place the variance item on a future agenda.

D. Notice Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Speaker: No Speaker Present

Subject: Notice of Community Development Block Grant funding opportunity was announced; no public comments were received.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed below within the consent agenda are considered to be routine by City Council and will be enacted with one motion. There will be no separate discussion of items unless the mayor or councilmember so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the general order of business and considered in its normal sequence.

No motion was made regarding the consent agenda items.

4. CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

A. Consideration and Possible Action on Purchase of New Computers for Police Department

Presenter: Dustin Breshears, Police Department

a. Summary:

- Most police department computers are Windows 10.
- Effective the following day, Windows 10 systems used for law enforcement will no longer be CJIS compliant.
- To maintain Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) compliance, Windows 11 is required.

b. Proposal: Purchase five (5) Panasonic Toughbook laptops to:

- a. Serve as in-car computers in patrol vehicles.
- b. Replace Windows 10 desktops in the station by using docking stations.
- c. Plan: Each officer will have a laptop that docks in the patrol car and in the office.
 - This will allow officers to:
 1. Complete reports in the field,
 2. Spend less time traveling back to the station.
- d. Cost & Justification:

- A detailed price quote was provided in a handout to council (exact numbers shown there; audio references a total in the \$30,000 range).

e. Key points:

- Toughbooks are the longstanding industry standard for law enforcement.
- They are CJIS compliant due to:
- The ability to remove and send individual hardware components for repair without sending the hard drive, thus protecting sensitive data.
- The devices are designed to be upgradable for 8–10 years, including future Windows versions (e.g., Windows 12), offering a long-term solution.
- Existing in-car docking stations are compatible, minimizing additional hardware costs.

c. Discussion:

1. Council confirmed the units are brand new.
2. Asked about:
 - Docking compatibility (existing car docks will work).
 - Future OS changes; Dustin reported the new hardware contains chips that allow future upgrades unlike many current Windows 10 units.

MOTION: Councilmember Ray Howard made a motion to approve the purchase of five (5) Panasonic Toughbook laptops for the Police Department as presented.

SECOND: Council member Rocky Hawkins.

VOTE: Voice vote announced as unanimous.

RESULT Approved.

B. Consideration and Possible Action on Purchase of New Computers for City Hall

Presenter: City Secretary Bryanne Doss

Need / Background: Current City Hall computers are aging and present:

- Security concerns,
- Reliability issues.
- City Hall's network is separate from Police Department's CJIS network.

1. Proposal:
 - Purchase five (5) computers for City Hall, including:
 - a. Three (3) laptops (City Secretary, finance, and one backup/float unit).
 - b. Two (2) stationary units (for Public Works and the front office).
 - MacBooks were favored due to:
 - a. Perceived better security (harder to hack),
 - b. Longer hardware life (Bryanne cited a personal MacBook still functional after 12 years),
 - c. Flexibility for:
 1. Working during outages,
 2. Bringing devices to **conference room meetings**.
 - Laptops will allow staff to:
 - a. Meet in the conference room and work collaboratively.
 - b. Continue limited operations during power or localized system failures.
 - c. Maintain a backup laptop to cover:
 1. Contract/temporary staff,
 2. A failed court workstation (Municipal Court, etc.).
 3. Municipal Court:
 - Uses eForce and FundView through the internet.
 - Court's data and systems remain separate and compliant; hardware changes in City Hall will not affect their compliance.
2. Cost & Funding:
 - Total cost for the 5 computers, including monitors and docking stations, is approximately \$15,815.
 - FEMA Reimbursement: Because FEMA is encouraging electronic permitting, and these computers will support that:
 - a. The city plans to file with FEMA to seek up to 75% reimbursement on qualifying technology.
 - b. Bryanne emphasized FEMA coverage is not guaranteed:
 - c. Application will be made,
 - d. Funds are not assumed until actually received.

MOTION: Approve the purchase of five (5) new City Hall computers (three laptops, two stationary units, with monitors and docks) at a total cost of \$15,815. Made by Councilmember Ray Howard

SECOND: Councilmember Rocky Hawkins.

VOTE: Voice vote announced as unanimous.

RESULT: Motion Carries unanimously.

C. Consideration and Possible Action on Contracting Professional IT Services for Police Department and City Hall

Presenters: Bryanne Doss and Dustin Breshears

1. Purpose: To secure ongoing, professional IT support for the City Hall network, and The Police Department's CJIS network.

Key Points:

- HCTC (Hill Country Telephone Cooperative) is currently working on an IT services proposal that would:
- Provide monitoring and support but do not meet CJIS standards.
- They estimated about six weeks to develop a complete solution/estimate to bring services up to compliance.
- CJIS Compliance Requirements:
 - a. Any person with remote access to the PD network must be fingerprinted and pass CJIS background checks. On-site IT technicians without CJIS clearance may work on PD machines only if accompanied by a CJIS-certified officer/staff member.
 - b. A weekly/regular monitoring and audit trail is required to show the system is secure.
 - c. Other IT providers have expressed interest:
 - Council preference is to use local providers if they can fully meet CJIS and security requirements.

MOTION: No Motion

RESULT: No Vote

- No formal motion or contract approval occurred at this meeting.
- Staff were directed to:
 1. Continue working with HCTC and, if necessary, other vendors,
 2. Bring back a specific IT services proposal for council consideration once complete.

D. Consideration and Possible Action on Approval to Move Forward with Formal Annexation Procedures – Proposed Subdivision

Property: Approx. 54–55 acres on Beaver Road, located in the Ingram ETJ.

Presenters: Glen White and Todd Vaughn, managing partners, Beaver Road LLC

1. Key Point of Proposed Development:
 - A. An RV resort with:
 - Approximately 46 “motor coach home” / casita lots,
 - Additional RV sites.
 - B. Project design:
 - All structures will be placed outside the FEMA floodway, on higher ground approximately 40–45 feet above the river level.
 - Residents will have river access, but no structures will be built in the floodway.
 - Sewer and Utilities:
 - C. Developers intend to: bore under the Guadalupe River to connect to the City’s sewer system on the opposite bank.
 - D. Construct a lift station at their expense.
 - E. They are also working with Aqua to upgrade the water system for the entire area.
2. Consideration of Annexation:
 - A. Developers wish to have the property annexed into the City of Ingram.
 - B. They stated:
 - Annexation would be contingent upon:
 - Being able to construct the sewer bore under the river,
 - Receiving all required environmental and regulatory approvals.
 - Estimated project scale:
 - Suggested the completed development could create around \$50 million in taxable value for the city (approximate figure).
 - C. Council Discussion / Response:
 1. Expressed appreciation for the advance notice and information.
 2. Noted this would be a “fancy,” master-planned development, similar in some respects to Buckhorn, but more systematically planned from the outset.
 3. Expressed preference for sewer connections over septic systems, consistent with city goals to reduce septic discharge to the river.
 4. No formal annexation action was taken.

MOTION: No Motion

RESULT: Future Consideration:

- Council indicated support in principle and recognition of potential benefits.
- Developers are expected to return with:
 1. A formal petition for annexation,
 2. Detailed engineering and permit documentation.

E. Consideration and Possible Action on Date Proposed for Christmas Parade

Presenter: City Secretary Bryanne Doss

1. Key Points:

- A. Marvin Willis contacted the city asking if a Christmas parade date had been set; also emailed indicating interest in December 20.
- B. Council recalled that last year's parade was held in the first or second week of December, timed partly around Kerrville's Christmas activities so floats could participate in multiple parades.
- C. Council suggested checking with Comfort and Kerrville to coordinate dates so that participants can keep floats assembled and attend multiple events.

MOTION: No Motion

RESULT: Future Consideration:

- Item was tabled.
- Staff were directed to:
 1. Determine when Kerrville and Comfort will hold their parades,
 2. Bring back a proposed date for Ingram's parade to maximize participation.

F. Consideration and Possible Action on Accepting Christmas Tree and Purchase of Ornaments and Light Pole Décor

Presenter: City Secretary Bryanne Doss

1. Key Points:

- A. A local resident offered to donate a 20-foot pre-lit Christmas tree to the city.
- B. Placement & Additional Décor:
- C. Possible tree location discussed near the flagpole in front of City Hall (if it fits safely), or alternative locations if necessary.
- D. Existing light-pole decorations:

- Many are aged and need refurbishing.
- Bryanne and Stuart are exploring having school art students refurbish/refresh the decorations.
- Additional decorations:
 1. City has added new light poles; more decorations (or banners) are needed to cover them.
 2. Banners on alternating poles were suggested as a cost-efficient option.
 3. Rough price range for banners: \$125–\$500 each, depending on style.

E. Discussion included potentially using Hotel Occupancy Tax (HOT) funds for decorations, as they support tourism and public events.

F. Community Involvement:

- Ideas discussed:
 1. Business decorating contests,
 2. Encouraging widespread holiday decoration throughout town, particularly meaningful after the flood.

MOTION: No Motion

RESULT: Item tabled.

- Staff were directed to:
 1. Confirm logistics for accepting and placing the donated 20-ft tree.
 2. Obtain quotes for banners and any additional pole decorations.
 3. Return to council with specific cost proposals and locations.

5. ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A. Revised Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance – Floodways & Recreational Vehicles

Presenters: Mayor Claud Jordan, City Secretary Bryanne Doss, and Code Enforcement Officer Stuart Gross

1. Ordinance Section Discussed (Chapter 3 — Building Regulations
 - Article 3.06 — Flood Damage Prevention):**
 - A. Section E – Floodways (within the city’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance).
 - B. Proposed changes (as read by Mayor Jordan and highlighted in the handout):

C. In FEMA-designated floodways, encroachments (fill, new construction, substantial improvements, and other development) are prohibited unless:

- Professional hydrologic and hydraulic analysis demonstrates no increase in flood levels during the base flood.
- Recreational vehicles (RVs):
- Are strictly prohibited within the regulatory floodway.
- Any exceptions for RVs elsewhere in the ordinance do not apply within the floodway.

2. Review Discussion:

A. Floodway vs. Floodplain:

- The floodway is the area of greatest hazard, where fast-moving floodwaters carry debris and cause erosive forces.
- FEMA mapping (used to permit septic systems and other development) clearly designates certain riverfront areas as floodway.
 1. Existing Structures:
 - Existing riverfront homes may be repaired if damage is less than 50% of pre-flood value.
 - If substantially damaged (>50%), they cannot be rebuilt in their prior configuration; any rebuild must:
 - Be elevated to at least base flood elevation + 1 ft (freeboard), and
 - Not expand the footprint.

B. RVs in Floodway:

- FEMA and state guidance view RVs in the floodway as unsafe and non-compliant due to:
- Potential for units to become projectiles,
- Risk to human life during sudden flooding.

C. Permitting Language:

- City permit forms require staff to certify that the proposed structure/use is “reasonably safe from flooding.”
- After the July 4 flood, staff stated they cannot in good conscience sign a permit for RVs in the mapped floodway and claim they are reasonably safe.

D. FEMA / NFIP Compliance Concerns:

- If the city continues to allow prohibited uses (RVs in the floodway):
- During a FEMA audit, Ingram could be found out of compliance.
- Potential consequences:

- Loss of eligibility for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for the entire city – no resident could purchase flood insurance.
- Loss or reduction of FEMA disaster assistance for future events, possibly permanently.

3. Public Comment & Discussion (Summarized):

- Multiple residents and park tenants expressed: Fear of displacement and loss of homes if RVs are banned in the floodway.
- Belief that July 4 was an extremely rare event.
- Hope that river sirens and alert systems could provide sufficient warning to evacuate RVs.
- Concerns about financial hardship, asking:
 - Who will pay for moving, raising, or replacing RVs?
 - Whether FEMA, the city, or property owners will bear the cost.
- Some speakers suggested:
 - Tabling any decision until:
 - FEMA aid and grant programs are clarified, and
 - Residents know what assistance (if any) might be available.
 - If FEMA insists on no RVs in the floodway, FEMA should help fund relocation or elevation.
- Council and staff emphasized:
 - Personal experiences of:
 - Watching RVs and people being swept away in past events.
 - Recovering victims after the July 4 flood.
 - Their priority is life safety and avoiding future tragedies, even if extreme floods are infrequent.
- Possible Engineering Solutions:
 - Idea discussed: raising an entire park on stilts/pilings above the required elevation.
 - Must not use fill dirt to raise grade in the floodway (no net displacement allowed).
 - Such a solution would be very costly and still subject to FEMA/engineering review.

MOTION: No Motion Discussion remained ongoing and contentious when the transcript ended.

RESULT: Item was tabled for further review and possible later action.

B. Item 5(b) Amendment Resolution for Grant CDV23-0506 was not taken up at this meeting.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Staff reports were waived.

7. OLD/NEW BUSINESS INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION

None

8. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION

None

9. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

None

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council recessed into Executive Session at 6:46 PM pursuant to Texas Government Code §551.071 to consult with the City Attorney regarding council vote procedures.

The Council reconvened in open session following discussion with attorney at the estimated time of 7:20 PM. The exact time was not clearly recorded. No action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

The motion to adjournment motion was not clearly stated. Accordingly, the exact time of adjournment is not available from the record reviewed, but all agenda items were completed. Based on the length of the available recording, the meeting appears to have adjourned at approximately **7:23 p.m.**

STATEMENT REGARDING RECONSTRUCTION

These minutes have been reconstructed from the available transcript and audio recording and reflect the best available record of actions taken, in compliance with Texas Government Code §551.021.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct record of the City Council meeting to the best of my knowledge and based upon available documentation and recording.

Jaqueline Gueth

CITY SECRETARY/ACTING CITY SECRETARY



APPROVED



APPROVED WITH CHANGES



REJECTED

CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED ON

3/16/26

DATE:

FINAL ACCEPTANCE

[Signature]

MAYOR / DATE

Jaqueline Gueth 3/16/26

ATTEST / DATE

