

Report of Milo G. Coffrin of
Arch Creek Drainage District Meeting-Dec. 1, 1921.

1171

I attended the meeting of the property owners interested in the proposed Arch Creek Drainage District, Thursday evening, December 2, 1921, which meeting was held in the K of P Hall at Arch Creek.

At a previous meeting the following committee was appointed: James Bright, Chairman, A. M. Griffing, R. D. Stephens, J. C. Baile and E. D. V. Burr and this committee, together with the Secretary, George P. Elliott, met at the office of the Biscayne Park Estates (Griffing's office) Saturday, November 17th, and went over the ground and maps and discussed ways and means of prosecuting the work of the proposed canal. The committee accepted Mr. Bright's offer to have his engineer go over the ground with Mr. Stephens. At this previous meeting the committee agreed to retain McCaskill & McCaskill as attorneys.

The meeting last night was called to order by A. M. Griffing, who acted as chairman, with George P. Elliott as Secretary. Before the arrival of Mr. Bright with his engineer, D. C. Clune, Mr. Stephens was called on and told that the purpose of the meeting was to hear the report of the engineer and to decide whether or not the proposed drainage canal was favored by the property owners, and if it was favored, whether the outlet should be through Little Arch Creek or whether the canal should be dredged directly east from Biscayne Station to the bay.

Engineer Clune reported that he had gone over the proposed route and suggested a canal to start in Section 28-52-41, on lands owned by Mr. Bright and run in a northeasterly direction to Section 14-52-41. From this point it would run east into Section 13 and thence southerly through Section 24-52-41, and Sections 19 and 30-52-42 and follow the old Tuttle Ditch southeasterly through Sections 30 and 31-52-42 to about the junction of the F. E. C. Ry. and the south line of Section 31, thence east along the south section lines of Sections 31 and 32 to the head waters of Little Arch Creek, thence follow this creek to Big Arch Creek and on out to the bay through the latter stream. He said from an engineering standpoint it would be better to cut through to the bay at Biscayne, but he believed the Little Arch Creek route would carry off the water. His proposition was to deepen and dredge out the creek to a width of 25 feet and make it about 8 feet deep. He estimated that it would cost \$2600.00 to clean out Big Arch Creek to a width of 25 feet from the bay to the junction of Little Arch Creek and that his estimate of dredging out Little Arch Creek would be about \$26500.00 or \$29500.00 including a concrete highway bridge. (He estimated that the cut from the railway east to the bay, 30 feet wide, would cost about \$15000.00 but this route met with so much opposition from the Arch Creek citizens that it was abandoned. They were all in favor of the Little Arch Creek route so as to clean out the creek and remove the growth therein and improve the unsanitary condition of same, which was reported to be nothing more than a swamp at the present time).

Clune's estimate for a 25 foot canal ^{if dredged} from center of Section 28-52-41 over above route and out through Little Arch Creek in-

1171

cluding two concrete highway bridges and a concrete railway bridge was about \$95,000.00. As I remember it he stated that this would make a canal about 54,000 feet in length including the distance through the creeks and he estimated that it would drain about 20 sections of land, or about 13,000 acres.

Mr. McCullough made a motion which was carried that the meeting go on record as favoring the route from the bay through Big Arch Creek to Little Arch Creek and up the latter to the south section line of Section 32-52-42 at which point it was to ~~XXXXX~~ extend westerly to the railway and then follow the old Tuttle ditch in a northwesterly direction, from this point northwesterly the course of the canal to be determined by the engineer's survey, when made later.

Some of the grove owners on the high land around Arch Creek were afraid the drainage would injure their groves and they put through a motion that the canal contain such locks or wiers as would enable them to hold the water to a depth of within 18 inches of the surface of the ground.

The committee above mentioned was continued to handle any further negotiations necessary to further the project.

About 25 persons attended the meeting. Burr and Baile, members of the committee, were not present.

December 2, 1921.

Milo O. Coffrin.