

THE STATE OF TEXAS :
COUNTY OF HIDALGO :

0148 715

BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 20TH day of
MAY, 1993, after due notice having been given, there was begun
and holden, a SPECIAL MEETING of the Commissioners' Court in the
Commissioners' Courtroom of the Administration Building in the
City of Edinburg, Hidalgo County, Texas with the following
members of said Court present and participating:

Hon. J. Edgar Ruiz
County Judge

Hon. Samuel Sanchez
County Commissioner, Precinct #1

Hon. Lalo Arcaute
County Commissioner, Precinct #2

Hon. Juan Rosel
County Commissioner, Precinct #3

Hon. Leonard Camarillo
County Commissioner, Precinct #4

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings

were had, to-wit:

-----000-----

MAY 20, 1993

The Honorable J. Edgar Ruiz, County Judge, called the Commissioners' Court meeting to order, whereupon the following proceedings were had, to-wit:

ADD. 1. PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

A. Subdivision:

1. Shea Estates Subdivision - Pct. #2

A motion was made by Commissioner Arcaute, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, to approve the plat of Shea Estates Subdivision, which is located inside the city limits of Alamo, in Precinct Two.

MOTION CARRIED.
SEE "EXHIBIT B"

ITEM 1. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF 1994 - 1996 URBAN COUNTY ALLOCATION FORMULA AND AUTHORIZE COUNTY JUDGE TO EXECUTE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

Judge Ruiz informed the Court that the Urban County Advisory Council had met at South Padre Island, on May 15th and they had participated in discussions and had finally approved an allocation formula, which was being presented to this Commissioners' Court at this time. The proposed formula would give allocations of \$490,000.00 to the member cities, those being: Alamo, Alton, Donna, Edcouch, Elsa, Hidalgo, La Joya, La Villa, Mercedes, San Juan and Weslaco would receive an allocation of \$550,000.00. The County of Hidalgo would receive an allocation of \$2,550,000.00 and this would cover the four County Precincts, as well as allocations for Progreso, Progreso Lakes, Palmhurst, Penitas, Palmview and Granjeno. Judge Ruiz stated that this formula passed by a voiced vote, in which all cities were represented. At this point, the County Judge requested that the recommendation of the Advisory Council be approved and Commissioner Arcaute, stated that he was not able to be present at the conference, and he wanted to know what the breakdown of the County's allocation was with respect to the exhibit that was presented (Exhibit A). The County Judge then briefed the Court on what was discussed at the conference. Commissioner Rosel was not in favor of the proposed formula, with respect to the County's portion and the allocation of both Palmview and the newly incorporated cities. He then stated that he had an alternate plan and he would like to present it to this Court. The County Judge then stated that if the Commission was not in favor of the original plan then they should take a vote, before they review any other plans. He then stated for the record that "no one wanted to make a motion to approve nor do they want to make a motion to disapprove and...that on behalf of the [Advisory] Committee, I am recommending this plan." The Commissioners all agreed that they would like all plans presented before they make a decision. Commissioner Arcaute then questioned the Advisory Committee on the reason why Palmview was being reduced and Mayor Tom Rocchio, Chairman of this Committee, explained that the cities that do tax and have a tax base, felt that cities that did not tax "should be eligible for the same type of funding, because the people in the community were not putting into their community the same amount of money or the same work that the people that were paying taxes were." This, he stated, was a main concern of the Committee. He also felt that the formula that was presented by the Committee was fair and he felt that it should be approved. Commissioner Rosel still felt that the newly incorporated cities should have been allocated some money, as the member cities, and that Palmview should be considered "as one of your full-share members, but still, [he] didn't think that they should get a full share, because there is not enough money there, but [he thought] that they should get an in-

(05/20/93)

crease", and he compared Palmview to La Villa, in both funding and population. Commissioner Arcaute didn't feel that a tax base should be related to this allocation. Commissioner Rosel then presented his alternate plan (Exhibit A-1) and a discussion ensued with comments from Commissioner Sanchez. As per the Commissioner Rosel's plan, the cities of Progreso, Penitas and Granjeno would receive \$90,000.00, each coming from the County's share and the City of Palmview would receive a total of \$400,000.00. Arturo Guajardo, the Mayor for the City of San Juan, then came before the Court and stated that the reason that their plan had been approved, by the Advisory Committee, was that all the cities had agreed to cut their allocations in order to increase the County's allocation, to assist the newly incorporated cities. He also felt that this Commissioners' Court should not approve an alternate plan until it is further reviewed by the Advisory Committee. Judge Ruiz then stated that there was no time for further negotiation, since the plan had to be submitted to HUD the following day. Efrain Garza, the Mayor for the City of Penitas, then asked that if they came under the County's allocation, would they be considered a member of the Advisory Committee. The County Judge answered that this action would not call for these newly incorporated areas to be considered as voting members, in the Committee, and he felt that this decision would have to come before the Advisory Committee. Mayor Tom Rocchio stated that he felt that once they [cities] sign a cooperative agreement, they would be considered voting members. David Alaniz, Mayor Pro-Tem for the City of La Villa, also came before the Court and he felt that the cuts should be equal among the member cities and Salvador Vela, the Mayor for the City of Alton stressed that the by-laws should be followed. Commissioner Rosel then questioned Mayor Tom Rocchio and tried to negotiate with him by reducing the eleven member cities, with the exception of Weslaco, on the original plan (Exhibit A), to \$480,000.00, reducing Weslaco to an amount of \$500,000.00 and increase Palmview to \$400,000.00 with the remainder going into the County's allocation to help increase the allocation of the newly incorporated cities. All the administrative costs would then come from the County's allocation and he was recommending this plan at this time. Mayor Rocchio felt that it seemed fair, but he couldn't speak on behalf of the other member cities. Mayor Guajardo then came up and voiced his concern on the County being allocated such a large amount. After further discussion, a motion was made by Commissioner Arcaute, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, to accept the Advisory Council's plan, as it was approved and discussed at the Island.

MOTION CARRIED. (COMMISSIONER ROSEL VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION)
SEE "EXHIBITS A & A1"

A motion was made by Commissioner Arcaute, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, to authorize the County Judge to execute any and all cooperative agreements as submitted by the cities to participate in Urban County.

MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. Commissioners' Court may go into Executive Session pursuant to Article 6252-17, Section 2g, V.T.C.S. to discuss the following matter:

1. Evaluation of candidates for Executive Director of Hidalgo County Office of Employment & Training

Judge Ruiz informed the Court that a week ago this Court had interviewed ten applicants for the position of Executive Director for the Office of Employment and Training. They had at that time narrowed the number down to three applicants, who were: Carol Elaine West, Gary Sollner and Jaime Ramos. At this time the Commissioners' Court would go into Executive Session for final interviews and to discuss the eva-

luation of the three candidates.

NO ACTION.

ITEM 3. OPEN SESSION:

A. Candidates for Executive Director for Hidalgo County Office
of Employment & Training

After about two and a half hours, the County Judge and Commissioners came back into Open Session. The Judge then stated they had completed final interviews with the three individuals and a decision would be announced the following Commissioners' Court meeting.

NO ACTION.

There being no further business to come before the Court, a motion was made by Commissioner Arcaute, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez that said meeting of Commissioners' Court be hereby adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED.

