

DRAINAGE DISTRICT #1

The Honorable Renato Cuellar, County Judge, called the Drainage District #1 Board meeting to order, whereupon the following proceedings were had, to wit:

Judge Cuellar announced that Commissioners Arcaute and Handy were not present and that the meeting was in order with a quorum of three members of the Drainage District #1 Board present.

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM 1. APPROVAL OF CHECK REGISTER AND PAYMENT OF CLAIMS AND BILLS - COUNTY AUDITOR

ITEM 2. PERMIT:

A. Green Gate Groves Subdivision
(See Exhibit A)

ITEM 3. PARTIAL RELEASE OF EASEMENT - Home Depot Project

The County Judge introduced the Consent Agenda and there being no changes, additions or deletions, a motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the consent agenda as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

REGULAR AGENDA

ITEM 1. EXEMPTION FROM BIDDING PROCESS - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - AND AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH SIGLER, WINSTON & GREENWOOD - FM 1016 PROJECT TO BE REIMBURSED 100% BY CITY OF MCALLEN AS PER INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT DATED 4/7/98

Godfrey Garza, Drainage District Manager, informed the Court that this was related to the interlocal that was presented to Commissioners' Court the previous week. He stated that this project consisted of the improvements to FM 1016 by the Texas

Highway Department, by the Trade Zone, which is west of 23rd Street. The city of McAllen is requesting that the County hire Sigler, Winston & Greenwood to assist them in the preparation of a permit for the structure going through the flood way; because of this firm's experience with IBWC, they are hoping to expedite the matter being that they are on a tight schedule. Under the terms of the interlocal agreement the City of McAllen will reimburse the Drainage District 100% for all costs associated with this expense. The amount of the contract is \$6,300.00. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

(See Exhibit B)

ITEM 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR DISTRICT MANAGER TO REVIEW PLATS FOR DRAINAGE AND TO SIGN OFF FOR DISTRICT

Godfrey Garza was also requesting approval of a form certification to be required on all subdivision plats prior to recording. He stated that this was based on discussion with Commissioners' Court, Planning Department, the City of McAllen and the County Legal Counsel. He reported that legal counsel has drawn up a certificate that they feel will comply with the requirements of Water Code Section 49.211 in which the District will review for drainage the subdivision, may it be inside or outside the city which are allowable or required by State law. If approved this certificate will be placed on the plats for the District's review. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR DISTRICT MANAGER TO REVIEW PLATS FOR DRAINAGE AND TO SIGN OFF FOR DISTRICT

Mr. Garza stated that they were requesting for the District Manager to have the authority to be authorized on behalf of the Board to review the plats for drainage and approve certification for them to go for recording. If there should be an issue that an owner and the District Manager can not work out, then they have the right to come before the Board to request a variance from what the norm would be. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 4. PURCHASING DEPARTMENT:

A. Hidalgo County Drainage District No. 1

1. Requesting authority to advertise for bid on "South Main/North Main Junction Modification"

Martha Salazar, the Purchasing Director, came before the Court and stated that she was requesting authority to advertise for bids on "South Main/North Main Junction Modification". Godfrey Garza then explained that was for the modification of a structure on Canton Road, for a diversion of water south and north to provide more relief on the south side. The projected construction costs are \$87-90,000.00. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit C)

There being no further business to come before the Drainage District #1 Board, a motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel that said meeting be hereby adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED.

COMMISSIONERS' COURT

The Honorable Renato Cuellar, County Judge, called the Commissioners' Court meeting to order whereupon the following proceedings were had, to-wit:

Judge Cuellar announced that Commissioners Arcaute and Handy were not present and that the meeting was in order with a quorum of three members of the Commissioners' Court present.

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM 1. APPROVAL OF CHECK REGISTER AND PAYMENT OF CLAIMS AND BILLS - COUNTY AUDITOR

ITEM 2. LINE ITEM TRANSFERS:

- A. Commissioner Pct. 1 - Parks - \$7,600.00
- B. Commissioner Pct. 1 - Road & Bridge - \$25,000.00
- C. Commissioner Pct. 1 - Administration - \$150.00
- D. Commissioner Pct. 3 - Landfill - \$1,000.00
- E. Commissioner Pct. 4 - Landfill - \$2,250.00
- F. Adult Probation - Community Corrections - \$124.00
- G. Constable Pct. 5 - \$1,000.00

(See Exhibit D)

ITEM 3. COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

- A. Monthly Fee Report for the Month of March, 1998 - Total of \$116, 313.23

(See Exhibit E)

ITEM 4. DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE:

- A. Monthly fee Report for the Month of March, 1998 - total of \$184,773.30

(See Exhibit F)

ITEM 5. URBAN COUNTY PROGRAM:

- A. Home - First-time Homebuyer Contract Agreement and Letter of Commitment to Mortgage Company - 5 Families

(See Exhibit G)

ITEM 6. RIGHT OF WAY:

- A. Permits:
 - 1. Pct. 1 & 4 - North Alamo Water Supply
 - 2. Pct. 3 - Coastal Oil & Gas USA

(See Exhibit H)

ITEM 7. PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

- A. Release of Letter of Credit:
 - 1. Vista Bonita Subdivision #10 - Pct. 4

(See Exhibit I)

ITEM 8. PURCHASING DEPARTMENT:

- A. Library System:
 - 1. Approval of Maintenance Agreement with International Copier Corporation

(See Exhibit J)

The County Judge introduced the consent agenda. Martha Salazar, the Purchasing Director announced that Item 8 was contingent upon review by Legal Counsel. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the consent agenda as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.

REGULAR AGENDA

ITEM 1. OPEN FORUM

The County Judge announced that three people had signed up for the open forum this morning and he called on Carol Munoz who proceeded to read from a document. After her reading she went ahead and handed a copy of her letter to each of the members of the Commissioners' Court as well as a small article from "The Monitor" about a two year child who fell in an unmonitored open septic tank. Judge Cuellar then called on Mr. Adam Daniec and he also read from a letter that he had prepared and handed a copy to each of the Commissioners. (Both of these letters are attached and made a part of the minutes.) Finally, the County Judge called on Mr. Bob Pool who said the following:

"When I went in the business in 1970, there were none of the rules that you have here today. The man came out inspected the property, that's when I learned that you had to have it tested and all that sort of thing. He tested it, he found it excellent and we've had no trouble since. At that time, he also explained to me that the soil tests or percolation tests should be checked on every piece of property although it was not the law, but I said okay that's what we're going to do. We went in there we tested before we bought the land, we put the water lines on it and put the paved roads on it, no requirements, from the State or the County. As a result our business grew beyond what most people did. I see no reason to pass these laws that were primarily made for upper northern Texas and the Dallas and Fort Worth area, where you've got a gumbo clay there to, and, and it's, it's obviously you can't use, but down here it's different, we have one of the finest percolation soils in the world, right here, in Hidalgo County. True, there's parts of Hidalgo County that are not, but we are taking percolation tests wherever they are to make sure that they comply. There is no reason to by-pass this thing and, and make these people pay extra money to, to have what they could get for nothing. And that's exactly what you're doing. These are people that can't afford these things and, and by adding these additional expenses, by the County, is an impossible situation. I ask the County, the Board here to go back to the percolation tests that they used to have and make them pass the test and, and confirm the law. Thank you very much."

Commissioner Rosel then questioned legal counsel on how Commissioners' Court could respond to any of these issues. He asked if it was possible for a response to be placed on the agenda for the following week, by one of the County Commissioners. Mr. Steve Crain, the County Legal Counsel, replied that they would have to place it on the agenda and indicate specifically what they would be discussing.

NO ACTION
(See Exhibits K)

ITEM 2. PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

- A. Discussion and Possible Action on a Variance Request
 - 1. Alvaro Martinez - Pct. 4

Emilio Garcia, the Chief Planner, came before the Court and stated that this item had come before the Court two weeks before. He indicated that this individual has met with both the Planning Department and Commissioner Garces. The original request was to build a homestead within a tract off of FM 1925. Commissioner Garces reported that he discussed this matter with the City of McAllen and being that this development was structured in 1984, it pre-dated the requirements when the standards were set. The City has said that it would not endorse it, however if the County chooses to grant a variance the City will issue the certificate of compliance for the hardship case. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to accept the variance and approve the request of Alvaro Martinez.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit L)

ITEM 3. COUNTY JUDGE'S OFFICE:

- A. Consideration and Action on Renewal of Contract for the Collection of Delinquent Taxes - Lucy Canales
- B. Consideration and approval of an Interlocal Agreement between the Cities of McAllen, Edinburg, Weslaco and the County of Hidalgo
- C. Approval of contract award in the amount of \$9,011.00 and \$5,198.00 for Public Health Services from the Texas Department of Health
- D. Approval to create a Warrants Officer position and a Warrants Coordinator position
- E. Approval to appropriate budget
- F. Set Salaries

3/A

Paul Vazaldua, Administrative Assistant to the County Judge, came before the Court and stated that they were requesting action on the renewal of a contract for the collection of delinquent taxes. Lucy Canales, from the firm of Linebarger, Heard, Goggan, Blair, Graham, Peña & Sampson, informed the Court that during this last two-year contract period they have been coming to Commissioners' Court on a quarterly basis, informing them of what has been done in the collection of delinquent taxes. She then proceeded to handout two graphs to the Commissioners' Court on their progress within the last seven months. Commissioner Garces asked if this firm had set up a system for Hidalgo County or if it was the same one that was used by other entities. Ms. Canales replied that each entity was set up based on their

needs, and therefore the plan was different for each client. Commissioner Rosel posed the question of what would someone have to put together, as far as funds and/or equipment in order to run a business that dealt with the collection of delinquent taxes. Ms. Canales responded that one thing to be considered is that their firm only deals with the collection of delinquent taxes. Mr. Juan Peña, from the same firm, came into the discussion by adding that since January 1st, they had merged with their number competitor across the State. As a result they now have a larger support staff, computer hardware and software worth over a million dollars and also the experience of at least twelve years of doing nothing but collect delinquent taxes. He then went on to explain of the overall tax collection process, his office only tries to collect the 12% in taxes that is not paid and out of this the firm gets 15% that is not paid for by the citizens of Hidalgo County. They accomplish this collection through telephone calls, by having mail-outs, setting up payment plans, and finally through litigation. Commissioner Rosel commented that the correct way to go about this would be through RFP, but being that this is not a very competitive business, it would not be a very good idea since the two competitors have merged to form one firm. His question at this time was whether to go out for RFPs or to just renew the present contract. Commissioner Garces came into the discussion by asking what firm out there would be willing to put up their law firm just to collect delinquent taxes and he added that no one out there would do this. Mr. Peña then mentioned all the entities that this firm represents, including Cameron County, the Appraisal District and Kleberg County, as well as Hidalgo County. Commissioner Rosel then added that the last time that this issue was brought before this Court he had asked the then Tax Assessor-Collector, Ciro Trevino, what he thought about going out for RFPs for this service and at the time Mr. Trevino had indicated that this firm had provided the best service in the collection of taxes. Mr. Armando Barrera, the Tax Assessor-Collector, then came up and also endorsed the renewal, due to the fact that it is a local firm and whenever he has a question on the collection of delinquent taxes he just needed to pick up the phone and get an answer. Commissioner Rosel asked the legal counsel what they would need in order to renew this contract and Steve Crain replied that they would require an exemption, under professional services. Commissioner Rosel also asked if this was a renewal of a contract or a new contract and Mr. Crain explained that he had not looked into this matter but that it appeared to him that this was a new contract. Commissioner Garces asked that they put the exemption on the agenda for next week in order to properly act on this matter, being that he felt that they had the best firm for the job.

Commissioner Rosel then commented on the situation that keeps re-occurring in that items are brought before Commissioners' Court that have not been properly reviewed by legal counsel or properly worded on the agenda. He recommended that a copy of the agenda be sent to legal counsel for review, before it is posted. Manuel Cavazos, the County Auditor, stated for the record that this County would have to put the matter out for proposals because it involved \$927,000.00 in fees. He added that "just because there are computers and programs out there doesn't mean that somebody else can't do it. You're paying 15%; that doesn't mean that the County can not do it for less". Mr. Peña begged to differ with Mr. Cavazos and explained why. A

motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to table this item at this time.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit M)

3/B

Paul Vazaldua continued by announcing that no action was needed on this item at this time. The reason was they needed more time to review this contract and also so legal counsel can review whether or not the County is eligible to participate in this type of consortium. Commissioner Garces had asked if the cities had come to an agreement on where the RAHC would be located, because if they hadn't then he had a concern with the County's participation. Mr. Vazaldua explained that the contract was for each of the entities named to select a member to a committee, who would then select a consultant to put together a package for the Hidalgo County RAHC. Commissioner Rosel interjected by asking if this meant that he had not submitted it to legal counsel for review and the response was in the affirmative.

NO ACTION.
(See Exhibit M)

3/C

Mr. Vazaldua was also requesting no action on this item. He reported that legal counsel has reviewed these contracts but there is a question on the way the population of Hidalgo County is stated in the contract and other issues with regards to the County's liability for accepting these awards.

NO ACTION.
(See Exhibit M)

3/D-F

Mr. Vazaldua explained that this next item was for approval to create a warrant officer position and a warrant coordinator position for the Criminal Auxiliary Court. He added that the funds would be coming from the grant positions and the warrant officer would handle felony warrants section, which would be under Judge Noe Gonzalez and the Board of Judges. Commissioner Garces indicated that he would like to look into this matter some more, as there was a similar situation with the County Courts at Law. Commissioner Rosel asked who would be doing the hiring for these positions and Mr. Vazaldua replied that the District Judge would. Commissioner Garces then pointed out that his concern was "that you have a judge selecting a warrant officer to go and execute and then he is going to preside over it or one of his colleagues" and he was not in agreement with this.

NO ACTION.
(See Exhibit M)

ITEM 4. TAX OFFICE:

- A. Authorization of Tax Refunds
 - 1. H & H Meat Products
 - 2. G E Roney

Yolanda Villescás, from the Tax Office, came before the Court requesting approval of tax refunds for H & H Meat Products in the amount of \$5,555.19 and G.E. Roney in the amount of \$1,517.38. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit N)

ITEM 5. COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM:

- A. Authorization to apply for LSTA Library Cooperation Grant for Public Libraries in Hidalgo County

Bill McGee, the Library System Director, came before the Court requesting permission to apply for an LSTA Library Cooperation Grant. He explained that these were federal funds that were administered through the Texas State Library and Archives Board. The purpose of the grant would be to enable them to enhance the system of making library resources available in a more timely basis. Mrs. Loura Etnire asked what the maximum matching funds would be and Mr. McGee replied that they would be approximately \$40,000.00; \$12,000.00 of which would come from the County Library System and the rest to be paid by the cities. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit O)

ITEM 6. COMMISSIONER PCT. 1:

- A. Approval of Land Exchange Deeds with the City of Weslaco pursuant of Interlocal Agreement

Raul Lozano, Precinct One Foreman, came before the Court requesting approval of land exchange deeds with the City of Weslaco pursuant to the interlocal agreement. Steve Crain, the County Legal Counsel, then mentioned that this approval was in order contingent on the part of the deed that has to do with property that has to do with the TJPC grant. He added that they have received oral approval from Mr. Silva, as to the

concept and they are still awaiting written approval. He added that the action required was to approve the two deeds, authorize the County Judge to execute those deeds on behalf of the County, subject only to final written approval from TJPC approving this transaction. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit P)

ITEM 7. COMMISSIONER PCT. 4:

- A. Request to reappoint Mr. Jose "Rosie" Longoria to the Hidalgo County Housing Authority Board

Commissioner Garces requested to reappoint Mr. Jose "Rosie" Longoria to the Hidalgo County Housing Authority Board and he made a motion to that effect. Upon a second by Commissioner Rosel, the motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit Q)

ITEM 8. URBAN COUNTY PROGRAM:

- A. City of Alton - Approval of commitment to enter into a Lease Purchase contract with Banc One Leasing Corporation for a Navistar Responder - Fire Truck
- B. Approval of Contract Amendment with CEC Consulting Engineers - City of Alamo - PFI Street Improvements Year 10 - 1997
- C. City of Elsa - Professional Service Agreement with J.E. Saenz and Associates FY 1995 and 1996 UCP Years 8 & 9
- D. City of La Joya - Approval of a water/sewer construction contract with the Mission Paving Company
- E. City of La Joya - Approval of water/sewer construction contract with the 5125 Company FY 1994 and 1995 UCP Yrs. 7 & *
- F. Approval of Budget Amendment for year 1994 - City of San Juan
- G. Transfer of \$6252.00 in surplus funds from Neighborhood Facilities to Water/Sewer Improvements Colonia Match - Pct. 4
- H. Termination of a construction contract previously awarded to ACE Irrigation, and Award of Contract to the next lowest bidder. City of Alton - Auto Sprinkler and Grass Proposal
- I. Approval of a budget amendment for Colonia Development Interest Expense in the amount of \$6,000.00
- J. Approval of budget amendment to budget \$14,000.00 to pay for County Clerk fees under the HOME Program

8/A

Anthony Covacevich, the Urban County Director, came before the Court and reported that the City of Alton was requesting approval of a commitment to enter into a lease purchase contract with Banc One Leasing Corporation for a Navistar Responder fire truck. This will be a yearly lease of \$27,022.66. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/B

The City of Alamo was requesting approval of a contract amendment with CEC Consulting Engineers for street improvements under Year 10. The amendment to the contract was to bring the amount from \$40,000.00 to \$54,700.00. This was on the Duranta Street project and the reason for the amendment was due to the additional work that is being done as a result of clay pipes and collapsing man-holes that will be replaced. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/C

The City of Elsa was requesting approval of a professional services agreement with J.E. Saenz and Associates. This will be out of Years 8 & 9 and this will be a professional services agreement to provide engineering services for the closure of the city's solid waste landfill. The amount of the contract is \$20,040.00. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/D

The City of La Joya was requesting approval of a water/sewer construction contract with Mission Paving Company. This project is in association with the water plant and the contract amount is \$72,000.00 and it was a low bid amongst three bidders. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/E

The City of La Joya was also requesting approval of a water/sewer construction contract with the 5125 Company. This is a project under Years 7 and 8 and it is in the amount of \$8,925.00 and it is a low bid amongst two bidders. It is for the installation of fire hydrants, assembly, complete ready for use including valves and all fittings. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/F

The City of San Juan was requesting approval of a budget amendment under Year 1994. The amendment was to move money from General Public Services and creating Crime Awareness in the amount of \$12,485.00 and lowering the Parks and Recreational Facility line item from \$401,312.00 to \$388,824.00. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/G

Precinct Four was requesting the transfer of \$6,252.00 in surplus funds from Neighborhood Facilities to Water/Sewer Improvements for the Colonia Match. This money had been inadvertently moved previously and the request was to move it back where it belonged. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/H

The City of Alton was requesting termination of a construction contract previously awarded to ACE Irrigation and award the contract to the next lowest bidder. This was for an auto sprinkler and grass proposal and the reason for the termination was that ACE Irrigation had not been able to provide workers compensation insurance or liability insurance as provided in the specifications. They were requesting that the contract be awarded to Valley Garden Center doing business as Southern Landscapes in the amount of \$10,624.38. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/I

Mr. Covacevich stated that this next item was for approval of a budget amendment for Colonia Development Interest Expense in the amount of \$6,000.00. He explained that this was for interest payments for the line of credit that they use with International Bank of Commerce (IBC). This interest payment will be coming from the General Fund. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

8/J

Mr. Covacevich was requesting approval of a budget amendment to budget \$14,000.00 to pay for County Clerk fees under the HOME Program. He explained that they have been paying this since the previous year and it is for the cost of recording documents that are required by the federal government. Mr. Covacevich added that instead of utilizing these monies to help people rehab their homes it was used for recording fees. He added that they will be preparing some legislative action to have the State legislature authorize the County Clerk to waive fees on projects that are federal and state grant projects that require recording of documents. Until then, they are requesting a budget amendment of \$14,000.00. Commissioner Rosel asked if the present County Clerk was being uncooperative or if he was restricted by statute. Mr. Covacevich replied that the Auditor's Office had indicated that the County Clerk does not have the power to waive fees. A motion was made by Commissioner Rosel and seconded by Commissioner Garces to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit R)

ITEM 9. PURCHASING DEPARTMENT:

- A. HIDALGO COUNTY PRECINCT NO. 1, 2 & 4
 - 1. Requesting Authority to advertise for "Crushed Caliche"
- B. HIDALGO COUNTY PRECINCT NO. 4
 - 1. Requesting authority to advertise for bid on "Paving Road - N. of F.M. 1925 (Approximately one (1) mile"
- C. HIDALGO COUNTY:
 - 1. Requesting authority to declare all tires available for surplus be declared as such for disposition by the purchasing department

9/A

Martha Salazar, the Purchasing Director, came before the Court requesting authorization to advertise for crushed caliche for Precincts One, Two and Four. A motion was a made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit S)

9/B

Mrs. Salazar was also requesting authority to advertise for bids on "Paving Road - N. of F.M. 1925 (approximately one mile)". This was under Precinct No. Four and it was for the paving of Seminary Road, north of F.M. 1925. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit S)

9/C

Mrs. Salazar announced that she was requesting authority to declare all tires available for surplus be declared as such for disposition by the Purchasing Department. She mentioned that this was stemming out of a project by Precinct Four, where they have been given authority to have the closure of a certain area of their landfill. She added that there are several materials that are allowed by the TNRCC for fill material and one of the item that is allowed is the shredded tire material. They will exchange the tires for the shredded tire material that is necessary for the landfill. After further discussion Mrs. Salazar mentioned that during numerous conversation with the proposed vendor, he had made initial conversations with Precinct Four that he would take a certain amount of tires per month; they are trying to expand those conversations to take all the tires. A motion was made by Commissioner Garces and seconded by Commissioner Rosel to approve the request as presented.

MOTION CARRIED.
(See Exhibit S)

ADD. 1. REPORT ON JAIL PROJECT (verbatim)

JUDGE CUELLAR We have an addendum. If you will recall last week I said I received a letter and I believe we might have, somebody present.

COMM. ROSEL We have one addendum or two, Judge? Let's see.

JUDGE CUELLAR The letter is being passed out that I received from Board of Architectural Examiners. Please read it for the record.

PAUL VAZALDUA Yes, Judge. "Dear Judge Cuellar, as indicated previously the Board of Architectural Examiners is investigating a statement of qualifications submitted to your office by a

group of individuals identified as Prospectiva. I understand that you will meet on April 7th, 1998, to consider this issue. During our investigation we have learned additional information that might be useful as you make your decision. Last week, we discovered that a Forrest A. Phillips, who's a founding partner of Phillip, Swagger Associates passed away in 1995. Interestingly, Mr. Phillips' signature appears at the bottom of the cover letter submitted to you by Prospectiva's statement of qualifications. Today, we contacted officials in New Mexico and asked about a project for which the statement of qualifications says Joe Lopez acted as the architect. We were surprised when we were told that La Tuna is not a State prison, as the statement of qualifications claims; it is a Federal Penitentiary and the facilities manager, who has been a the penitentiary for twenty-two years said that no architectural work had been done since he has been employed there. Because of the seriousness of this case, it is unlikely that we'll be able to resolve it at the agency level. I plan to put the case on the agenda for the next board meeting which is scheduled to take place May the 28th through the 30th. At that time, the Board should make a decision about how to resolve the case. Please note that until a final decision is made Mr. Lopez' professional license will remain in good standing. If you have any further questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me. Sincerely, Cynthia Canfield"

Cynthia Canfield, General Counsel for the Board and
Cynthia Robertson of the Board staff are both present today at this meeting.

JUDGE CUELLAR

Welcome. Would you like to address this Court?

CYNTHIA CANFIELD

Yes I would, thank you. Good morning, I'm Cynthia Canfield and I'm General Counsel for the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners and as Paul indicated when he read my letter I got up a little bit after four o'clock this morning to come down here to emphasize the seriousness of this case. I want to make sure that all of the Commissioners understand and I have been, I've spoken to Judge Cuellar on the phone and have been corresponding with him in writing also. So, I think he understands our position, but I just want to make sure that all of you, I know you have very busy schedules, but I want to make sure that you're aware of exactly how serious this investigation is for our office; and in addition to our office I know that the Engineering Board has also opened an investigation involving the same statement

of qualifications and I understand that the Texas Commission on Jail Standards has also raised some questions about this project. So, it's, it's a case that is so serious it's gotten the attention of, of more than one State agency. I expect that you'll probably get a visit sometime, or at least Hidalgo County will probably get a visit sometime in the near future from someone from the Engineers Board and their director of enforcement. I've been speaking with him and there are some, possible criminal violations involved, there are possible serious violations of the architects registration law involved and if you have any questions I, I'd like to answer those. I, I hope that all of you have been made aware of both of the letters that I have sent addressed to Judge Cuellar. The first one explaining a little bit more about the reasons for our opening the investigation in the first place and then the second one, of course which Paul just, just shared with you.

COMM. GARCES Ms. Canfield, if I may, just from the Precinct Four side of it, I'm going to give you a fax number, 381-5905, because it seems that the media gets a hold of all this information before we do.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Okay.

COMM. GARCES And, ah...

COMM. ROSEL Well, there's nothing wrong with that.

COMM. GARCES Kim is right there, and there's nothing wrong with it but, usually we find ourselves saying "I don't know", "I haven't heard about it"...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I understand...

COMM. GARCES ...and this is serious, you know...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD It is, it's very serious and I had a couple of people ask me why we contacted the media. So I do want you to know that we didn't contact the media. I have, we have a duty as you do to operate according to the open records act, so the things that are going on at our agency for the most part are subject to public inspection. So I have, not only a respons., well I have a responsibility to, to share certain information about what we're doing in our office, but also we felt like it was important, this area's very far removed from Austin. It's

difficult for us to come here and, and sort of make, make contact with you so I think the fact that the, at least one newspaper, I don't know if there had been more than one that has done the story on this, this issue has been a good thing.

COMM. GARCES I have no problem with the media finding out about this, but at least let us have it...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I understand that.

COMM. GARCES It does sound rather ridiculous for us to say, "where did you get this information"...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Oh, I completely agree with you...

COMM. GARCES ...and, it's been very consistent, that's what I'm getting at.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I understand that.

COMM. GARCES I, I feel that the Judge's office has been bombarded with all this information from your office...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Huh-hum.

COMM. GARCES ..and obviously the media's request. There are other four members that are going to make a deciding vote on this issue, I think we should all get in a timely manner.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Okay, I understand that, I appreciate that and I'll make sure that that happens. I, I wasn't real sure about how exactly the Court operated so I thought that just sending things to Judge Cuellar was appropriate and it would be disseminated.

JUDGE CUELLAR We can get a copy, we share with the Commissioners, immediately.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Okay, okay.

COMM. ROSEL When you say serious, does it mean that, ah, it's something that can not be corrected with a, with an eraser, move this from "column a" to "column b". I mean is this serious enough that it warrants a, an in depth investigation where as you may be looking at sixty days, ninety days, to be, thinking as to what the Board is going to recommend.

- CYNTHIA CANFIELD Yes, it's serious on two levels. One, is just the possible criminal violations that might have been committed by the people who are not licensed to practice architecture. On Texas law, it takes this so seriously that it makes not only the practice of architecture by an unlicensed person, that's a criminal offense but also if you offer to practice architecture and you're not licensed, if you pursue the practice of architecture in the State of Texas, then that's a criminal offense as well. So just these unlicensed people representing that they have these architectural qualifications that they don't have in one person, that specifically represented as a licensed architect and he's not licensed in Texas. Those things are very serious and on another level, hum, Mr. Lopez is registered with us, and the fact that Mr. Lopez might have been involved in assisting these unlicensed people in pursuing the practice of architecture is a very serious offense. Now, I want to emphasize that this is very, very much an investigation, formal findings have not been made, the case won't go before our Board until the end of May. At that point, I still think we'll probably be at least a few months from a final decision. His license remains in good standing, the other people involved in the statement of qualifications who we may end up filing or requesting that criminal charges be filed against them, none of that has happened yet; but in this case it's easier than a lot of the other cases we deal with because the, the potential problems are right there in black and white, so they're not things that will be, that you can just, it's not gonna be a sort of he said/she said kind of situation. We have...
- COMM. GARCES Hard copy.
- CYNTHIA CANFIELD ...pardon me?
- COMM. GARCES You have hard copy.
- CYNTHIA CANFIELD Exactly, yes.
- COMM. GARCES All right.
- COMM. ROSEL Well it's something that, that, that's an issue because of the proposal that they turned in...
- CYNTHIA CANFIELD Right.
- COMM. ROSEL And that's where it's at.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Right.

COMM. ROSEL Not anything because of what this Commissioners' Court might have said...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.

COMM. GARCES There's a big question of trust, now.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I'm sorry.

COMM. GARCES Not criminal, trust. Misrepresentation; these are things that come up when I'm...

COMM. ROSEL And I mean, that's the thing that they're going to have to decide...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Well, professional integrity is a big issue, I hope.

COMM. ROSEL Yeah. Obviously you, being General Counsel, you do talk to their attorney.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD No I haven't spoken to their attorney, but I have spoken with Mr. Lopez.

COMM. ROSEL Okay. So there is contact there?

JUDGE CUELLAR I believe, I believe Mr. Lopez is present. Would you like to address the Court?

JOE LOPEZ Yes sir.

JUDGE CUELLAR You have anything else you want to say, Ms. Canfield?

CYNTHIA CANFIELD No, I don't. I just, I will make sure I communicate with each one of you from now on and if you have any questions, please feel free to speak to me this morning or contact my office directly. I just...

COMM. GARCES Don't go away.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Okay, thank you.

JOE LOPEZ Good morning, Mayor, Commissioners, excuse me...

JUDGE CUELLAR

Good morning.

JOE LOPEZ

Judge, excuse me, I very excited here. Ah, yes, I'd like to, to state and I cer..., want to start by saying also that, ah, some of this information I agree for whatever reason was given to the press before we even knew about it. For example I never got a letter of, of the letter you got, I received it from your office, Judge, on Thursday or Friday, 'cause I didn't know what it was about. I would think that we should get a copy of it. When all this began I knew nothing about it, I was in San Antonio when the press already was printing it. I had no idea I even had a letter in my office, even registered. We hadn't, we had just barely received it. So, I need to, to certainly make you aware of that, then, we certainly have, ah, been in contact with the State. There are some, some items that, there's nothing wrong with the qualifications, as far as we're concerned. We still believe that we, we want to have the trust of the Commission, we know we've served the County for many years and we don't plan to, to go anywhere. We, we know that there are some typo errors there that were made. For example, this person that's a registered architect, he is a registered architect and that's in California. It doesn't say anywhere in Texas and that's what we hope to discuss with them. I do have a meeting scheduled with Ms. Canfield and her assist..., or her director, I believe, on May the 8th, that's the earliest that we could get a, an appointment to, to chat with them to, to try to resolve it, at a quicker level and I'm sure she has to send it on to the Board and maybe that'll be enough, at that level. I don't know how you could say that a person's not registered in stating their qualifications, which is all our brochure says. The person was registered in California, even before Texas was recognized as NCARB, which is a harder exam to pass at that time. It was a national exam, now it's been national..., nationalized. I believe, when we were meeting with the negotiating committee, we explained everyone of these items. We are and we have already, as a matter of fact I've got Mr. Al here with me, he's my assistant for business development. I'm not putting the blame on him, but certainly the, ah, the brochure and the wording and so forth was put through that department, you know, we each have different divisions that we're responsible for. Unfortunately, I can't possibly attend to everything personally, but they were errors that were made in haste and, and I would like to just give him a few minutes and a few minutes here to tell you what part he did. We know that our intent was never to, to

mislead anybody, we don't believe we gained anything by putting any person, for example that name, it was simply, ah, follow-up to a cover letter indicating this firm acknowledges that we're sending through. We agree that it was done incorrectly by, by the way the, ah, I think the PEO is put after it. I think at that particular time, Mr. Al didn't even know that this person had been deceased. We were still receiving information from our consultants, the most important thing we want to get is our qualifications. We sincerely believe that our qualifications will carry us through, we stand on our integrity and our reputation for our firm and we know that, ah, we have had over ninety percent of our clientele call us already and say, you know "why is this being targeted this way". Well, yes there are errors in the brochure and we, and, and I'm here to tell you that I admit that, but not the qualification-wise. I, I don't believe in that and I don't for one minute condone to that. We need to correct it, we are going to correct it and forward it to Ms. Canfield, for, for their review. For example, we're going to add the word "registered in California" and, and on this gentleman, but, but he's been registered, to practice in Europe, practice all over the United States does not take away his qualifications. That he's not registered in Texas, that's true. He doesn't need to be, I'm the only one that has to be registered in our firm. We do have, as you know, our association with the other firms, in El Paso, that are part of our group, we have four or five other registered architects that are ready to step in if we need them, but we don't need them for this project and if we need them for the workload, that's why we got our consultants. Ahm, their name has already been accepted as no problem with the Board, as far as having the name of Phil Swagger ----- Associates. The complete name they gave them, that's been already cleared. We apologize, we have no control on how quickly they could meet, we thought they were going to meet on March 30th, it appears that they didn't, I think, Judge thought they were going to meet on the 30th, but apparently it's for something else. I do have a meeting scheduled, like I said for the 8th of May, hopefully we can resolve this, certainly we need to correct our, certain our letter head, I mean that's something that we normally don't do on proposals. It was really done on a, I guess in an effort of honesty to you guys, saying "here, we're here, here's a cover letter, this is the team, here's what we have", but this particular individual was never part of the brochure. It's never part of, of gaining another engineer or gaining another professional, we, we, we don't believe that. We

hope to resolve this, certainly not only for the County, this is definitely hurting us in everything else and I talked to Ms. Canfield and I said "you know, how, how does the press hear all this before we do" or perhaps even before the Commissioners, 'cause I know I've talked to some of you, some of them are not here either, that, that I've talked to and neither had no idea about it. We don't even know what's going on, it's already printed. Perhaps that's the way to do it. We have forwarded them a letter, you know, through our attorney, perhaps two, three weeks ago, requesting, how did all this start, you know where's it coming from or...

COMM. GARCES

Who's they?

JOE LOPEZ

The Texas Board, Ms. Canfield's Office. I don't know that he's gotten an answer yet, I haven't spoken to my attorney on that yet, I didn't think it was necessary to have him here this morning, I, I thought certainly, you know, I need to tell you, here's where we are, here's where we stand, we hope to serve the County, like we always have, ah, we live here, we're, everybody knows our reputation, our qualifications, I, I believe Ms. Canfield and I'm not stating words that I didn't talk to her, she says, "I have no problem against your qualifications, but you did need some corrections on the brochure"; and I agree, we need to do that, but we certainly need to correct those items that were perhaps, but I don't believe that takes away from the qualifications that we presented to you; and that was our only intent, you know to get it to you quickly, efficiently and if I might, Judge, if I might ask Ronnie just to take a few of the things of how he perceived this, 'cause he's really the one who put, most of the information together on behalf of my firm and certainly the PSA firm.

RONNIE AL

Good morning, Judge, Commissioners, ahm, first of all I'd like to offer my apology to, to you sir and to the Commissioners and to TBAE for all this inconvenience that I have caused and, and I have to admit through my negligence, putting the wrong words in the, in, in the, ah, proposal. I used the wrong wording and I, I thought I'd done great, but apparently I didn't and consequently I have, I've hurt some people Mr. Rodupo Pesco, Mr. Rick De La Garza, ah, I've hurt my firm and I've, I've caused, ah, Ms. Canfield to be here and I, I didn't do it on purpose, I just thought I'd done it correctly. On Mr. Phillips, when I received all that information and I took it for granted, since I saw Phillips PSA

and I put his name down, where the P.E. I have no idea I put it there, that was my doing. I, and when I gave it to Mr. Lopez, he did ask me "have you checked with this" and I said "I have called PSA and I've told them that you're gonna sign for this gentleman, ah and you're going to initial it and they said it was okay" and he was, in fact, he was reluctant to sign, because he was not sure it was proper and he, he never lets a proposal go out without rev..., looking it over, but because it was, we did it in such a hurry, ah and it was due on that day, when I turned it in, he just signed it and didn't even look at it till later when it was brought to his attention and of course, by the time it was a little bit too late. So, for that I apologize to Commissioners' Court and to everyone concerned.

JOE LOPEZ

I think that's everything we have, Judge.

JUDGE CUELLAR

Thank you very much.

COMM. ROSEL

Ah, Judge, the only thing that I'd like to say is that, I believe, that when the specs were drawn up, the specs were drawn up with the intent as we were advised by the legal counsel that they needed to go ahead and make sure that on the proposal that they would, place all of the players that were going to play an intricate part in the construc..., or in the design of the jail and that those players there would not be subject to change. I believe that's the way that the attorney not, not trying to quote the attorney, but I believe that's what the attorney told us at that particular time. So, here we have a situation in which ah, the specs went out and, ah, they, the response to the proposal came in setting up "a through z" meaning that they, that the name of the company and how they were going to finish the job and they were thinking between all the players were, were there. So, what you begin to look at is when you begin to look at Phillips Swagger; Phillips Swagger was supposed to be the, a consultants or they were supposed to be the, ah, the professionals who were supposed to come in and do the design on the jail and I believe that's probably, some of the reason that you decided that, at time to vote with them, because of that professionalism that was there, expertise. And now we find out that Swagger, ah, is not there and that Phillips is also not there because of whatever reasons were stated here. Then you, you look at the, at the fact that your were designing a jail not a school like I've said here publicly when you, when you design a school this, this particular firm

has done countless numbers of schools and, and as far as I know they've done an excellent job on, on the design of, of schools; but when it comes to a jail, you're talking about a different total, totally different animal, Judge. So, I think that here you have a situation in which we can not obviously make any type of mistake in the selection of a particular architect to design a jail; because here we have an individual or individuals that come up to us and tell us that they made a mistake on a letterhead. Ah, what is it, if they make a mistake on the design of the jail, how many millions of dollars is it gonna cost these taxpayers. That is not right, I don't that we should take that kind of chance. So, I think that we should not, absolutely should not, without any, any doubt in my mind, we should not continue any negotiations with this firm, besides that, besides the fact of all the doubt that's there, because of all the questions that are there. I think that...

JUDGE CUELLAR

I told the Commissioners that you would not negotiate unless....

COMM. ROSEL

Well, if, but that's what my point, my next point, Judge, is the fact that we do not have until May, we do not have until June, we have the sake of this County and the reputation of this State, ah, this County at stake at this present time. So, I would suggest that you put on the Commissioners' Court agenda next week or we will or whatever is, needs to be done and please fax it to the attorney so that he can correct, ah, if something needs to be corrected, so that we can go ahead and take action next week to start negotiating, the, end the negotiation with this particular firm and start going in negotiations with the next firm, number two, which was the one that built thirty-one jails or the next and/or the next firm which was number three which was Croslin, which had numerous jails also. I think they had eight, but their, their specialty was juvenile detention, but there could be a, a marriage there that would work. So, I, we do not have any room for doubt, you know it better than I do, that this, you know, if we continue negotiations with this, I don't blame every taxpayer, every resident in this County of Hidalgo, coming against us because we deserve it.

JUDGE CUELLAR

I understand Commissioner, we would not continue negotiations, we'll take the other one under advisement, for the sake of legal counsel. I don't see any problem with that.

- COMM. ROSEL No, well, legal counsel, he's gonna make sure that we got the items properly posted, then this Commissioners' Court will vote one, two, three, four, five or one, two, three, whatever it's gonna take to do what is right, but he can just make sure it's on there correctly and that's what I want from you next week.
- COMM. GARCES Judge, the side that I was looking at in trying to, to see how Prospectiva was able to, to come on board and convince at least a majority of these votes here that we have. I think the side that convinced some of us was the expert of Phillip Swagger, now if you dissect, cut off Phillip Swagger, then you don't have that that expert that you're looking for.
- COMM. ROSEL Where is it?
- COMM. GARCES In the detention facility area that you're looking at, that's what we're looking at. That I think adds more to the credence of what Rosel is trying to say, is you don't have that now.
- COMM. ROSEL You don't and then you go back to when the specs went out, I mean, you've got to put your players out there and you can't be changing them in mid stream. That was one of critical issues that legal counsel discussed with us and, and if that's gonna happen, the only way that they can continue is for us to take that, what I showed you just a minute ago, for us, not him, for us to take the eraser and start erasing a lot of things and, and, and put a blindfold on our own eyes. Me, put a blindfold on my own eyes and continue. We can't do that. I will not do that.
- JUDGE CUELLAR Yes Mr. Lopez.
- JOE LOPEZ Thank you, Judge. The only thing I want to make clear, maybe, I didn't make it clear when I was speaking is that the firm of Phillip Swagger and Associates, still continues to operate. The State has no problem, and they already have their letter, of the name. The name is simply a corporation name, they have many architects, they work throughout the United States on jails, that's all they do. I want to make sure that certainly, Commissioner Rosel understands that they have not left the picture. They are still our experts, they're still our consultants and as a matter of fact we're putting a brochure together that we're going to supplement if you remember the, ah, negotiating committee requested some

additional information. We have that ready in our office to give to the Commissioners, but none of that has changed, none of the picture has changed. I don't want to mislead you, maybe I didn't speak clearly. They're, that's just name, it's like a corporation name that continues, ah, on any bid firm. They, they're not here tomorrow and, you know gone the next day, they're with us, they're our consultants and the team is still the same, the qualifications are identical, nothing has changed. Thank you, Judge.

COMM. ROSEL Ah, the young lady that approached this bench, ah...

COMM. GARCES Canfield.

COMM. ROSEL I'm sorry I didn't even catch her name.

JUDGE CUELLAR Cynthia Canfield.

COMM. ROSEL Ms. Canfield.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Yes, it's Cynthia Canfield.

COMM. ROSEL Did I hear you say that that these are serious, serious allegations that may warrant criminal charges?

CYNTHIA CANFIELD They are, they're very serious. The charges that might warrant criminal or the allegations that might warrant criminal charges involve these unregistered people who are not licenses as architects offering to perform architectural services. And this kind of a facility is something that Texas Law calls an institutional residential facility, which just means that people will be living there on a twenty-four hour basis and the Architects Registration Law which is the Texas Statute says that that kind of a facility has to be prepared, the plans and specs for that kind of a facility have to be prepared by a licensed architect or licensed architects. So that's, the only type of facility for which that kind of a distinction is made and for reasons I think that you eluded to, it's a unique kind of a, of a facility and, and that makes this case even more serious. In addition to that fact just the, the very, the numerous false statements contained in the statement of qualifications make the case so serious and the fact that also there is a licensed architect involved and I know that Mr. Lopez has indicated that he wasn't aware of the problems with the statement of qualifications, but he did sign his name to it. That concerns the Board tremendously.

COMM. GARCES Judge...

JUDGE CUELLAR Ms. Canfield...

COMM. GARCES ...how many...

JUDGE CUELLAR ...when I spoke to you the first time, you told me that the Board was going to hear this of last, last week.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I'm sorry if I misspoke, my Board only meets unfortunately, once a quarter, so, and they, they're not scheduled to meet again. They haven't met since January and won't meet again until May...

JUDGE CUELLAR What I'm saying, you told me that they would, were going to hear it and make a decision by the following day.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD They will, the Board will make a decision then...

JUDGE CUELLAR You told me last week.

COMM. GARCES No it was always May, end of May.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Yeah...

COMM. GARCES I mean the...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD I'm sorry if I miscommunicated that to you, I...

JUDGE CUELLAR You said that they would hear on the last, last month and they would give us a decision the following day.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD The Board will meet and I don't see any reason why...

JUDGE CUELLAR Next month.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Right, not until May. They met January and then won't meet again until May. And they will, I think, make a decision at that point, but if, I suspect because of the seriousness of this case, they're gonna make a decision that's not gonna be acceptable to Mr. Lopez and then he has the option to appeal that to District Court, which is what I foresee happening. And...

JUDGE CUELLAR But this time, right now he's still licensed...

CYNTHIA CANFIELD In good standing, absolutely.

JUDGE CUELLAR Anything else.

COMM. GARCES I'd like to see this thing on the agenda next week. We have a State agency, Judge, here telling us and I won't put words in your mouth, but you are saying that "hey, this is serious".

COMM. ROSEL (INAUDIBLE)

COMM. GARCES Yeah, and let me tell you something, if we were out and Joe hadn't applied for this thing and this would have come up, that tells the general contractor and this would have come up, I've would have dropped it. And we have a State Agency here telling us, not in so many words but saying this is serious and I'm looking at errors and omissions, you know once something is built like that, who's going to foot that bill, Judge. The taxpayer, that's who's going to have to...

COMM. ROSEL Well, if there's any criminal charges out there or not, as far as I concerned, that's their situation. What I'm concerned about is the fact that we're faced with a situation that we need to go on and if these people do not have the horse-saddle then move them out of the way and let's go to number two. And it's real simple, me and I'm not going to risk, I'm not gonna risk doing anything else.

JUDGE CUELLAR Anything else.

COMM. GARCES That's it, Judge.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Okay, thank you and I just want to say one last thing, it is something we take very seriously, I've been with the Board only a year and a half, but in the year and a half I've processed close to a thousand cases and this is the first trip I've made like this. So, it is very serious to us.

COMM. GARCES Again, Judge.

CYNTHIA CANFIELD Thank you.

COMM. ROSEL Thank you.

NO ACTION.
(See Exhibit)

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

MOTION CARRIED.