

THE STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF CAMERON

BE IT REMEMBERED on the 28th day of **JULY, 1998**, there was conducted a **REGULAR Public Meeting** of the **Honorable Commissioners' Court of Cameron County, Texas**, at the **Courthouse thereof, in the City of Brownsville, Texas**, for the purpose of transacting any and all business that may lawfully be brought before the same.

THE COURT MET AT:

9:30 A.M.

PRESENT:

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

PEDRO "PETE" BENAVIDES
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 1

CARLOS H. CASCOS, C.P.A.
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 2

JAMES R. MATZ
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 3

HECTOR PEÑA
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 4

Inelda T. Garcia Deputy
COUNTY CLERK

ABSENT:

The meeting was called to order by Judge Hinojosa at 10:00 A.M. He then asked Mr. Bob Clark, Brownsville resident, for the invocation and Commissioner Cascos to lead the Court and the audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Court considered the following matters as posted and filed for Record in the Office of the County Clerk on July 24, 1998, at 11:41 A.M., and the Supplemental Agenda filed on July 24, 1998, at 3:19 P. M:

(6) **ADOPTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION WITH THE DRAINAGE DISTRICTS, THE CITY OF BROWNSVILLE, THE CITY OF SAN BENITO, THE CITY OF PORT ISABEL, THE CITY OF LOS FRESNOS, THE CITY OF LA FERIA, AND THE CITY OF RIO HONDO, IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF THE DRAINAGE DISTRICTS IN CAMERON COUNTY**

At this time, Judge Hinojosa stated I think we've heard the proposal from my office. Did you have a comment Ms. Brodecky?@

Ms. Juanita Brodecky, Rio Hondo resident, stated those of us who have been paying this Drainage District Tax for many number of years, are very concerned about this. And I speak for a multitude of people in coming here today. The farmers are very concerned about this and you still are representing the rural areas, so we're going to have to consider the problems that the cities have brought upon us by creating a faster run-off than we've had in the past. We're going to have to consider the fact that our ditches are inadequate. But the citizens that have talked to me, don't feel that they deserve to be brought into a consolidation. What we are talking about here is the consolidation of a Drainage District and the benefits to the people that haven't paid this tax. Now, this may sound a little bit crass, but I do believe that those people that have paid taxes to provide for their own drainage to a certain degree, deserve more than equal consideration. If you people had been planning ahead, no, I say you people, realizing that you're not the ones who were sitting here. If this County hadn't been run by variances, we wouldn't have a lot of these problems. We're going to have to clean up these to some extent. But there is a limit to how much we can do. I sat right here and heard Grace just say when we flood.@ When we flood anywhere. When it is excessive flood anywhere. I lived in Oregon for years. When they had excessive rains in the mountains, we flooded. It doesn't make a bit of difference what kind of preparations you make. When you have a flood, you have a flood. Now, people who build in low areas, need to know that they are going to flood. Now, I don't think people who are poor can afford to lose everything they own every time it rains. That's my opinion. If you want to do something about getting them out of the flood plains, then you need to look at something more reasonable than just building a ditch along side by their houses and carrying more water in on them. Now, I was interested to know which Drainage District has thirty percent (30 %). I'd like to know that. I would like to know what I was told just now that District No. 3 is electing their officials. I didn't know a thing in the world about that. We appointed them, I remember this gracefully, that Matz appointed Steve and you contradicted him, Judge and put Garcia. This has created problems.@

Judge Hinojosa stated I think the Commissioners appointed Garcia.@

Ms. Brodecky stated AWell, they were at your recommendations. So we need to remember where we are on these things. We need to remember that we are going to flood down here on this delta regardless. No matter what you do we're still going to flood. Now, I sat there quietly and heard Hidalgo used as an example . But I listened to the news, so don't use that on me. I circled no tax increase but I didn't believe that. Read my lips, we will have a tax increase. I'm here representing a lot of poor people, working class people and the ones that I always represent. They are saying no to this. They are saying no because they've seen how you consolidated the Road System and we don't want anymore of that. We don't need anymore of that. Thank You.®

Judge Hinojosa AMr. Almazan.®

Mr. Almazan, Brownsville resident, expressed his concerns regarding the consolidation of the Drainage Districts.

Mr. Francisco Sifuentes, Brownsville resident stated AWe know that the duplication of machinery, employees, managers in these Districts create more expenses. And I believe very strongly that consolidating will cut down a lot of these expenses. Also the control, the internal control and the lack of some of these Commissioners, of representatives of these Districts, have been shown that they could not follow up on their work and the reports they are suppose to submit the County and the State of Texas. The way they conduct their voting process, I don't think they follow rules either. We have seen it in the past. And I think that by consolidating and having one District, there has to be more accountability and control. I would like to see that you form a committee to look into this in the very near future, because I will not like to pay on more District. I already pay too many taxes. To too many taxing entities. I'm sorry I didn't bring my tax statement, but we're paying too many taxing entities. And one more, we cannot afford. Thank You very much.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AYes, Mr. Holdar?®

Mr. Jim Holdar, Engineer, stated ACameron County Drainage District No. 1 passed a Resolution in support of the Drainage Plan presented to the Board. This Drainage Plan presented to the District No. 1 Board, consisted of District No. 1 expanding through the territory that is not in the Drainage District in the South. The plan which was presented this morning was not the plan that the Commissioners presented in the Resolution.®

Judge Hinojosa responded AWe understand that.®

Mr. Holdar stated AThe other thing in regard to taxes. I don't understand why you can possibly say the taxing is not willing to change as a result of this when we have tax rates at three cents per one hundred dollar valuation. And you have Districts with Bonds owed and you have Districts that have paid for their facilities since 1910. The bid deficiency of what was presented this morning is there is no definition of what the responsibilities and obligations of

the new Drainage Districts are going to be. I know in District No. 1 we have citizens routinely disappointed that District No. 1's functions is to maintain thirteen (13) main drains in the District, but not all the lateral drains and so forth. When you say you are going to provide drainage for people, they need to know what they are going to be provided. Is it only the main drains or how extensive the purpose of the District is going to be.®

Mr. Mark Hollon, AMy name is Mark Hollon. I am a 24 year old veteran of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and I am retired. So my comments are not for the Corp of Engineers, but as someone who has worked with them and has experience in flood control and drainage type studies. The Corp of Engineers study was done and we did recommend a Master Drainage District. And the County is not that, it is a consolidation of drainage. And it appears that areas that are in need of drainage improvements are going to be left out. To being next at some time later. And so what the County is proposing is not what the Corp of Engineers recommended.®

Judge Hinojosa responded ABut let me just interrupt you on that, Sir. We examined the alternative in the way the Corp of Engineers have recommended and there was only one way to do that, and that was to eliminate a referendum to eliminate all four. Drainage Districts No. 5, they have Bonds already. And it was going to be very difficult to do that, so the proposal of the consolidation is essentially the only way we could figure out to get to what the Corp of Engineers has recommended. It-s not that we don-t want to do that, it-s just that it-s the only way to get to that point.®

Mr. Hollon questioned ASo you were using the Corp of Engineers-s recommendations and you were saying this is what the Corp of Engineers recommended, and it was not. So it may be better presented as a one step in getting toward this. But you were looking then at separate annexations and you said, in the Order that the individual Drainage Districts.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AThe drainage. The one Drainage District that will remain.®

Mr. Hollon stated ASo, my point is that it is not the same thing. The consolidation of Drainage Districts and a Countywide Plan. The other part I would like to make is that the Corp of Engineers in recommending that, recommends that from an Engineer-s Study. When the Drainage improvements are left to the Engineers, that we have found it works very well. Now, you take Harris County for example, they have a Harris County Flood Control District. And, while we were doing flood control studies trying to determine what is the best Engineering solution that produced the most benefits and the least cost, Harris County was responding to political pressures and going out and making improvements in one area or another area. And we-re doing political Engineering rather than true Engineering. That is something that has to be planned or programmed when the County, if it does go to a Countywide Drainage Plan, and leave to the Engineers to solve these problems. I was not involved in the Cameron County Study. I did work

with the Engineer. I know the Engineer. He was still there. But I was involved in working with the Hidalgo County and they had a different problem than what Cameron County has. They had a large area with no outlets, so they had this major investment to dig this drain from Hidalgo County through Willacy County. And so that is one of the reasons why I think that they had this Consolidated Drainage District. And the lady was making the argument that all the smaller Drainage Districts, a lot of people don't know where to go if they have a drainage problem or flood control problem. And that if it was all brought to the County, will the people know. I would be willing to mention that if you were to stand outside the door here to the Courthouse and ask them where the County Commissioners=met, there would be a very small percent of people who know where and when that happens. So, there is advantages in keeping the individual Drainage Districts, in that the people know where they are and it will help focus those people to where they are. Well, what it does it keeps the tax money that those people are paying in that so they know what they are buying with their tax money. That concludes my comments. Thank You.®

Commissioner Cascos responded AOne follow-up comment on that and, you're probably right about not knowing when Commissioners= meet. But, at the same time, we get numerous calls with anything with the words ACameron County® in front of it. Whether it's Cameron County Drainage, Cameron County Irrigation, Cameron County gets the calls. If ditches need to be cleaned or whatever, so you are probably right. And, I think part of the problem that we are going to go through this is that we're not submitting enough information, at this point. What I've seen not only about that maybe, Road and Bridge, and this as well, but you know when I was listening to the other comments by Ms. Brodecky about Road and Bridge not working and that you know the same complaints that maybe she's hearing now. I got the same complaints from the urban residents when we consolidated the Road and Bridge. And the rural areas benefit the most with the Road and Bridge consolidations, because as always, the urban areas pay for all the improvements in the rural areas. If it weren't for the areas, rural improvements would be to a minimum, if you start strictly focusing those tax monies just in that area alone. And, I agree with you and I disagree with Grace, and I told her this last week. I have a real problem suggesting that we're not going to have a tax increase. I think Mr. Holdar brought up that's very, very accurate when you do consolidations whose tax rate are you going to use? Are you going to use the three cents or the fifteen cents. Obviously, unless you have some mechanism to differentiate and all that stuff. There's not a whole lot of big difference between three cents and fifteen cents to maybe a lot of you in this room, but it is to a lot to more people that are not in this room today. I agree with your comments. Thank You.®

Judge Hinojosa stated ALet me point out one of the things with respect to that, give you an example of this where people have a hard time identifying where to go to. For the longest period of time, some of the residents on California Road couldn't get anybody to deal with their drainage problems. Every time it rained, there was a drainage

ditch that went under water that was, I think eighteen (18) inches wide. They went to Drainage District No. 1, nobody said, they said 'Well, that's not our ditch.' They went to the County to Commissioner Matz and he said 'Well, that's not a County function.' They couldn't get anybody to help them and we're talking about thirty (30) houses or so that are in that area. And every single time it would flood. We finally went to them. They came to me and said 'Well, I don't know what to do about this, we don't have that function.' We sat down with the Irrigation District that was in that area and we said we'll provide the culverts if you provide the manpower and the work to put the necessary size culverts. The problem got fixed, what about three or four months ago, but there was no one to go to except for us. And that's not our function. The same exact thing happened in the Valle Escondido area. There was no one who wanted to take responsibility for that. We finally used \$345,000 of money that's designated for Precinct No. 1, in order to engage in some major infrastructure work that we believe is going to solve part of the problem of flooding in Valle Escondido. The problem we have got now, though, is who is going to maintain that ditch. There is no one to maintain it. Is the County going to maintain it? That's a real big problem, a big gap in our system. When we're dealing with Green-Valley Acres, I mean that has flooded for two (2) years in a row. When we sat down and talked to the person that we contracted with and see what the problem was, I don't think anybody ever figured out how come it floods there so bad. Other than the fact that it is real low. But what can you do to resolve it? The response was, well, we need to spend a bunch of money to widen an irrigating ditch that has been the same for thirty (30) or forty (40) years, in order to deal with that problem. It's really in a situation that needs major improvements, but there is not any money to do that. I can go on and on. I have met with every Mayor. Let me tell you the Mayors I've met with. I've met with the Mayor of the City of Port Isabel, with the Mayor of the City of La Feria, with the Mayor of the City of Rio Hondo, with the Mayor of the Brownsville, with the Mayor of the City of San Benito, with the Mayor of the City of Harlingen, with the Mayor of the City of La Feria, and every single Mayor that I met with, thought that we needed to do some kind of a consolidated plan in Cameron County and develop a Countywide comprehensive plan. Everyone of the Mayors. Now, it seems to me that, and contrary, I'm out there. This would be something that would save us a whole bunch of money in the long run. We use \$345,000 of money that we could have used elsewhere to fix a drainage ditch that should have been fixed by a Drainage District. We've also found is that people don't know who is in their Drainage District, when their meetings are, when their elections are held, who is their Drainage District Director. A good example is, except for maybe Commissioner Matz, the one who knew that now Drainage District No. 3 has elections. There was no election. They didn't have an election because nobody knew that there was people running at that time. We've never, checked the minutes and we've never appointed the people, in my opinion, in Drainage District No. 1. And I didn't know who

any of the members are. And, I in fact have asked every single Mayor and I think virtually everyone of the Mayors didn't know who were the Directors in the Drainage District.

Ms. Brodecky stated "That's their fault."

Judge Hinojosa replied "Well, that's besides the point. The point is that we have got a problem, where there are people who don't know who to go to on an issue that is of major fundamental importance to the citizens of Cameron County."

Ms. Brodecky replied "They come to me."

Judge Hinojosa stated "And I just think that we are presenting a Plan that is going to take a lot of steps to get to where it needs to get. It may not be the most perfect plan in the world and I recognize that, but it's the only Plan on the table to be able to deal with that. Now, here is an alternative proposal to create three (3) Drainage Districts on three (3) water sheds. It seems to me that's defeating the purpose of consolidating, because you've only got four (4) right now. It seems to me that to create three (3) separate Drainage Districts with the same situation that we have got now is leaving us to where we were before. The Drainage Districts have had a long time to deal with some of these issues. Drainage District No. 1 has been around for a long time and a lot of problems exist with respect to Drainage in the Southern part of the County that have never been addressed by Drainage District No. 1. It may be that the resources that they have are inadequate to do it. But that is besides the point. They are the entity that is suppose to be in charge of doing it. We believe, or I believe in my office that this is the only solution that exists right now for dealing with the problem that has existed for a long time. The other people that were responsible for dealing with it have not dealt with it. It's not a headache that anybody in my Office wanted to undertake, but it's the only solution that we had to the severe suffering that we have seen in Cameron County over the last few years. And it's severe. If you go out there and you walk into those Colonias, when it floods and there is four (4) feet of water, and there's two (2) feet of water in peoples homes. And there's babies on couches and people losing their cars and their houses. The foundations undermine and there are moved out to live a week or ten (10) days in a gymnasium of a high school. That's a whole bunch of suffering and a whole bunch of money that is lost. The State of Texas and the Federal government have pumped in an enormous amount of money along with Cameron County to deal with the results of all these floods. And my feelings are we need to start working towards dealing with the problem that exists. And I believe that a consolidation is the way to get to that. It isn't in it of itself to solve the problem. It's in my opinion, the first step to get there. The Drainage Districts then have to take a look at starting to engage in County wide planning to look at where they need to annex. The proposal has been to annex into Drainage District No. 5 because Drainage District No. 5 is the District that is engaged in some major infra structural development and is well on it's way towards developing

significant improvements in Drainage District No. 5. And they were annexing into, they were proposing to annexing to increase the territory. But, I just don't see that it makes any sense to have four (4) and a half Drainage Districts all over the County when the problem just hasn't been dealt with.®

Commissioner Matz stated, "I have got several comments, Judge. First, it seems to me there is, not only a lack of information, Carlos, but maybe some misinformation on this issue. I'm looking at page 47 in the book which was given to us, under the heading "County wide Drainage Myth through to Reality." In the third paragraph, it reads, "while the North or Central part of the County solves its problem, the south increases, and one group of people's happiness becomes the other groups sorrow. What the South part of the County has to realize is that the North part is focusing hard on drainage and will eventually catch up with the amount of resources the South has dedicated to reduce flooding. The more successful the North becomes in solving their drainage problem, the more problems they will create for the South part of the County because the water has only one way to go. A faster flow rate in the North means water hitting the South all at one time." I suggest, that perhaps this is a pretty good indication of misconception that we have here.

We have a Drainage System in Cameron County different from Hidalgo County, as the gentleman pointed out. Hidalgo went to the one (1) District arrangement because of the ditch they needed to build to the Laguna Madre to drain the whole County through Willacy County. And of course, as we all know, the indictments and the corruption and the rest of that started in Hidalgo County, what about three (3) or four (4) years ago through that Drainage System procurement. That having been said, we have a System now that was created based on watersheds and local problems. In my opinion, "local" is what this is about. We might have disagreements concerning who has access, who is accountable and that sort of thing, but on the other hand those folks are local people. They know the situation best. They are there. They go to the coffee shops, they go to the restaurants and they are accessible to all the people in that area. I remember when we had the flood in 1991, in Harlingen, San Benito, Combes, Primera, Palm Valley area. Now that wasn't just Harlingen. That (the flood) impacted a number of different areas. Those areas petitioned the Court and in my opinion, the Court played its proper role, and that was to be supportive in establishing a context for an Election and doing a study to establish the terms of reference for the creation of Drainage District No. 5. And, by the way, that (the creation of the District) was passed by a vote of 87% of the people, and it (the bond issue) does provide a tax rate of fifteen cents per one hundred (dollars of valuation). And, Carlos, now that's half of what our County's tax rate is, and that's a lot of money, whether you are in this room or not. It's very significant. And Drainage District No. 3 has got the same tax rate and they are doing some rather massive improvements.

But the point I want to make is there was a problem in an area (of this County). The people came together and they said >yes, we have got a problem. We're going to solve it ourselves and we're going to pay for it.- To me, that's what we should be looking at in this case.

Now, as far as taxes are concerned, Mr. Sifuentes, there's no free lunch. I mean, we have been through this time and time before. I mean, Valle Escondido area, the Southmost area. Go back to the Minutes of February. This is a problem that was created from the run-off out of Brownsville. It should be addressed by a Drainage District that has some control, authority and responsibility for this area. Jim (Holdar), you did the study(for Drainage District No. 6). I don't see why half of the tax revenue would have to go into overhead that is generated by the taxes. I mean, if you look at what's being done in some of the other Districts, it would seem to me you can reduce that (the overhead costs) significantly.

Mr. Holdar responded, AWell what happened when Drainage District No. 6. It's original proposal from District No. 6 was in the area of Drainage District No. 2, which was in Southmost. After meeting with the Commissioner, the Mayor, the City of Brownsville, it turned out that we could not get enough political support to pass an election including Brownsville in District No. 6. And when we took Brownsville out, we took out farm areas with the farm areas owners and the agriculture exemptions and so forth. That it reduced the tax base down to where the anticipated tax revenue and the reasonable tax rate was about \$69,000. And whenever you put the minimal amount in administrative costs on administering a District that's about half of the revenues and at that time the commissioners Court decided not to proceed with trying to pass and establish the District.

Commissioner Cascos questioned, AJim, is that what we talked about several years ago?. Then there were members of the City Commission, one in particular, who didn't want that to happened?@

Mr. Holdar replied, Aone of them was opposed to it and the rest of the Commissioners were non-committal.

Commissioner Cascos stated, Aso, then it just died. So that effort has been made. They tried to do that in the Southern part.@

Commissioner Matz stated, ABut the point is, we had the same problem in the Northern part of the County, in Harlingen, Primera, Palm Valley, Combes area, and the only way we made it work was by taking in half of Harlingen. And Pete, it takes political will, and it takes determination. We educated people.@

Commissioner Cascos stated A We tried that and they didn't want that. Maybe it's different now.@

Commissioner Matz stated, AWell, but you have to go to an election, Carlos. And it never came to an election here.@

Commissioner Cascos stated, AIt never got that far@.

Commissioner Matz reiterated, ANo, it did not@.

Mr. Sifuentes stated, AWith your comment to the >free lunch=, the problem is the other way around, because I paid taxes for ten (10) years to the Irrigation and Drainage District. A few of my neighbors from Rio del Sol and myself went to the District and asked them what was the status about this. I said does this Irrigation and Drainage District know they are not a Drainage District . And they said it in public that they are an Irrigation District. So they are giving this water and their irrigation to the farmers and we=are paying. Because we didn=t have irrigation. So, we=are giving them free lunches.

Commissioner Matz responded, AWith all due respect, you need to hold them accountable in my opinion. The last couple of points I=d like to make are, we have got all kinds of proposals out here. I=ve seen different Resolutions and I=ve seen different maps. And, we just got the most recent Resolution, which was not the one which was in the packet, calling for a single District. And, I suspect what we=are going to do is go through even more. But I would like to point out that Drainage District No. 5 and their Representative here, have passed a Resolution of their own, which is a matter of record, (saying) that they did not accept the Resolution that was presented by the County. And Natalie, do you want to make a comment, please?@

Ms. Natalie Prim, Harlingen City Manager, stated, AGood Morning, Judge Hinojosa, Mayor Connie de la Garza and I met in early May. We sat down and walked through your plan with you at that time. Let me just say that Harlingen has the ability to look at Drainage in the last five, six years, in an incremental basis. We put several million dollars into the ground for improvements to our Drainage and it=s inside our City limits. We have right now, about two million dollars on the ground, either in design or under construction, to improve local flooding. So, it is a concern of ours as well. And, we have worked very diligently over a multi-year approach to try to make some improvements. We=ve used General Funds, tax revenue that we get, and we have some funds from Certificates of Obligations and also, we=ve used Community Development Funds. I guess my real concern is that we have, as a growing municipality, to be concerned with our local needs. What I am going to do in the next week is we=are going to be developing a staff recommendation on this, but, I do know right now that Mayor de la Garza has voiced his opposition. I=m just letting you know that. Just in the last day, I think he=s tried to make some phone calls to you.@

Judge Hinojosa stated, Ahe hasn=t called me.@

Ms. Prim noted, AWell, I do know that his opposition was to be known. We are right now going to seek the consensus of our City Commission. I just want to let you know that and let you know that we=ll be discussing it in our meeting next week, August 5th. Any questions? Thank you.@

Judge Hinojosa stated, "Let me also point out with respect to No. 3 and No 5. I think that we need to, the public needs to know that then, both have the same engineer, they both have the same Attorneys, they have three contracts with No. 5, for No. 5 to do a lot of its work."

Mr. Jack Brown, Engineer, stated, "Excuse me. That's not true, Judge."

Judge Hinojosa responded, "That's what we understand."

Mr. Brown stated, "No. 3 doesn't contract with No. 5; No 5 doesn't do any work for No 3."

Judge Hinojosa stated, "Well, then that's my mistake. That's what I understood. But you do have the same Engineer and the same lawyers, right?"

Mr. Brown replied, "Yes, for economy sakes, yes."

Commissioner Cascos questioned, "Do they give you half rates?"

Mr. Brown responded, "We get a real good rate, \$100 a month, Carlos, is pretty cheap."

Mr. Holdar stated, "\$50.00 a meeting. The other work can be done by me or can be done by other Engineers. I don't have a lock on either one. Both Districts have contracted with other Engineers for specific projects. Where we are not able to deliver on time. It's just like going to McDonald's. You order a burger, you pay for it. We don't have any bill to the District, except for on-going work."

Commissioner Cascos stated, "I don't have any big problem with the Attorney and Engineer stuff."

Mr. Brown stated, "I like to point out, a lot has been said about the Corp of Engineer's Plan. I was here, I was your County Engineer, when we went through that Plan. When we developed it and I worked very closely with the Corp on that. It's true that it recommends a County -wide District. This gentlemen has explained from a pure Engineering aspect, that it's the easiest and best thing. But also, in that study, if you'll recall it, it does not recommend a project because it is not economically feasible. The costs exceed the benefit to the community that takes into account all the social and economic aspects of drainage damage to homes, damage to businesses, the cost of transportation, damages to crops. All of this is taken into account by the Corp Economists, in developing the cost benefits."

Judge Hinojosa stated "But the cost benefits ratio relates to the recommended improvements that the Corp of Engineers has recommended. Not in terms in creating a County wide Drainage District. Let's get that clear in order to start the process in dealing with the drainage issues on a County wide basis and developing one tax base to better use your resources. I mean, there's a hodge podge way of doing things. I mean, somebody was saying that the Drainage District follows today's watershed lines. Drainage District No. three (3) goes into the Southern watershed. It doesn't follow the watershed lines completely. There is not a uniform way of doing business in Cameron County, under any situation."

Mr. Brown stated A Drainage is the local issues, in April of 1991.

Judge Hinojosa stated A You can say the same thing about roads, you can say the same thing about policemen, you can say the same thing about every thing that Cameron County engages in that are local issues. @

Ms. Brown stated AI have to use all the roads. The police can all protect me, but my water can't get to Brownsville. The water that falls in my street has to get out to the Arroyo Colorado. Unless somebody picks it up and carries it to Brownsville, it has no impact on Brownsville. It is based on watersheds, and watersheds are the best plan dealing with drainage. I'm afraid this man can explain that to you. @

Judge Hinojosa stated A All right. Anything else?

Ms. Brodecky stated A That includes all, and Grace has said we should all tap in and take advantage. And I think it is what the County is trying to do, tap into some of this and take advantage, and I for one, I am not easy to take advantage of. @

Judge Hinojosa stated A All right, well let me make a motion, and I like to modify the motion that we have got here, in order to eliminate any issues with respect to what cities are with supporting it, and which are not. I would just like it to be a Resolution, not a Joint Resolution of Cameron County. Just a Resolution by Cameron County. My motion is that we pass a Resolution for, which is the Resolution that has been handed to you for the creation, and not a Joint Resolution, just a Cameron County Commissioners= Court Resolution, for the creation of one (1) County, (1) drainage or for the consolidation of Drainage District No. 3, No. 1, and No. 4 into Drainage District No. 5 for creation, and to have Drainage District No. five (5) be the only Drainage District in Cameron County and that would be my motion. Is there a second? @

Commissioner Benavidez responded AI=I second that motion.

Commissioner Cascos stated A Let me just ask a couple of questions. This is basically a non-binding Resolution? @

Judge Hinojosa stated A That's right, the voters have to decide. @

Commissioner Cascos stated A so the voters still have to go to the polls in November and vote on this. No. 1, and No. 2. I hope that in the interim, and I'm going to support this, but I hope that in the interim, we have enough workshops and public meetings. And let's really hear what these voters are going to say because ultimately, when they go to the polls, they are going to decide whether they want to do this or not. So this may be all mute, but at least we tried to do something. @

Commissioner Matz stated A my comment, just for the record is to repeat what Mr. Holdar said that Drainage District No. 1, that's who you represent? @

Mr Holdar replied Ayes.®

Commissioner Matz stated Adid pass a Resolution, in support, but it was not in support of what the motion is on the floor right now.®

Mr. Holdar responded Athat-s correct.®

Commissioner Matz stated AO.K.®

Commissioner Cascos questioned AHow does it differ, is it just the fact going from No. 2 to No. 1?®

Mr. Holdar replied AThe motion Drainage District No.1 passed, as I understood, was that Drainage District No.1 would encompass this present area plus south of Resaca, South to, I think, Center point Road or Centerline Road. And the area of the County North of that would be one (1) or two (2) Drainage District-s encompassing the remainder of the County.®

Commissioner Cascos asked AWould it be too confusing when we put it on the Agenda to put one (1), two (2), or none? Instead of an Aye or Nay, one (1) district, two (2) districts, or no districts?®

Mr. Holdar stated AIt-s for the people to know what functions the District or Districts are going to perform. You mentioned California Road, you know, that is an area that wasn-t served by a District one (1) main drains.®

Judge Hinojosa ABut it is in your jurisdiction,

Mr. Holder responded AIt was in my District there was no Right of Way provided for in the subdivisions, there was no one providing Right of Way.®

Judge Hinojosa asked AWho does that ditch belong to?®

Mr. Holdar replied A I don-t know who it belongs to Judge. It doesn-t belong to District No. 1.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned AWell, who built it?®

Mr. Holdar replied AThis is what the people need to know. Are they voting for a program that-s going to get the water out of their backyard or are they voting for a program that is going to make main drains that the Cities and the water districts, farms and individuals can drain into and get out. What is the extent of the Drainage that they are voting for.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AAnd I think that-s a big, big problem.®

Mr Holdar stated Anone of the Districts and none of the Agencies are going to drain your backyard at the present time.®

Commissioner Matz confirmed Athat-s for sure.®

Judge Hinojosa stated A I think you-re exactly right®

Mr. Holdar stated It has not been made clear this morning or previously of what this Master Drainage District function is going to be. It's passed over drainage. Everybody wants drainage, but it doesn't say how it's going to be accomplished or what's going to be accomplished.®

Judge Hinojosa stated All right, any further discussion?®

Commissioner Matz stated I would just for the record, Judge, I don't know, when you talk about California Road, you said people called me and I didn't do anything. I don't know who they were. I don't recall having any of those calls. I'd like to know who they were and I would be glad to talk to them.®

Judge Hinojosa responded A.O.K. I'll give you the names. All right, any further discussion all those in favor signify by saying aye. All those apposed? Passes on a four (4) to one (1) vote.®

Judge Hinojosa restated the motion that the Resolution by Cameron County be adopted for the consolidation of the Drainage Districts No. 3, No. 1 and No. 4 into Drainage District No. 5, and that Drainage District No. 5 be the only Drainage District in Cameron County.®

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Cascos and Peña

NAY: Commissioner Matz.

The Resolution is as follows:

NOTE: Judge Hinojosa left the Courtroom at this time:

(1) APPROVAL OF COUNTY CLAIMS

Commissioner Cascos expressed concern as to Warrants No. 406 and No. 947, payable to Lorda Corporation and noted that there had been issues raised regarding the repairs to the air conditioner.

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, responded that both Warrants were payable to Lorda Corp with the same amounts and noted that Warrant No. 947 might have been duplicated.

At this time, Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property Management Coordinator, reported that Lorda Corp had agreed to the responsibilities, but noted that the amount of the rent had been increased.

Commissioner Cascos suggested that Warrant No. 947 be deferred until the proper Amendment as to the rent increase was clarified and resolved.

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the County Claims were approved as presented by the County Auditor, with the exception of Warrant No. 947.



(2) APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND/OR SALARY SCHEDULES

At this time, Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, presented an additional Budget Amendment for the County Treasurer-s Travel Line Item, for approval.

Commissioner Matz moved that the 1998 Fiscal Year Budget Amendment No. 98-18, inclusive of the additional Budget Amendment for the County Treasurer, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

The Budget Amendments are as follows:

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA RETURNED TO THE COURTROOM:

(12) ACTION ACKNOWLEDGING THE CITY OF BROWNSVILLE'S DETERMINATION THAT THE SUNNY SKIES COLONIAS IS A GRAND- FATHERED SUBDIVISION AND THAT A PLAT OF RECORD IS NOT REQUIRED

At this time, Mr. Frank Bejarano, Planning Development and Management Director, stated that the City of Brownsville did not require a Plat of Record for the Sunny Skies Colonia, and added that since there was dual jurisdiction in the Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ), the Engineering Department had recommended that the County should require the Plat of Record. He noted that the State law allowed the County to waive the requirements for the Subdivision Plat, subject to the County providing water and sewer through the Project.

Mr. Richard Burst, County Attorney, confirmed that the requirements should be enforced in order to comply with the State's Model Rules and noted that the correct wording to exempt the water and sewer requirements should be placed on the next Commissioners' Court Agenda.

Ms. Mary Ann Reed, Legal Aid, stated that the residents of Sunny Skies requested that the Project proceed without any delays, and expressed support for the exemption of the requirements.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, the City of Brownsville's determination that the Sunny Skies Colonias is a Grand fathered Subdivision and that a Plat of Record was not required was acknowledged, subject to providing exemptions at the next meeting.



(13) ACTION TO AWARD THE BID FOR WATER AND SEWER IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SUNNY SKIES COLONIA AND AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (TCDP CONTRACT NO. 716035)

Mr. Frank Bejarano, Program Development and Management Director, explained that the bid was solely for construction costs and added that there would be administrative costs involved, and that any remaining balance would be allocated into the road project.

Commissioner Benavides moved that the low bid for water and sewer improvements for the Sunny Skies Colonia be awarded to Cubco Construction, and that the Construction Contract, that being the Texas Community Development Program Contract No. 716035, be negotiated.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously.



(14) **ACTION TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF THE COLONIA HOUSING STANDARDS DEVELOPED BY THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS FOR RESIDENTIAL INSPECTIONS IN THE SUNNY SKIES COLONIA**

Commissioner Benavides moved that the Colonia Housing Standards, developed by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, for residential inspections in the Sunny Skies Colonia be utilized.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously.

(3) **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 30, 1998, REGULAR MEETING; JULY 10, 1998, AND JULY 16, 1998, SPECIAL MEETINGS**

At this time, Commissioner Cascos expressed concern as to the Contracts in the Commissioners= Court Minutes packet not being fully executed.

Ms. Inelda T. Garcia, Chief Deputy, explained that the required documents and signatures were obtained by the Clerk-s Office and that the Minutes were not officially recorded until the documents were fully executed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held June 30, 1998, at 9:30 A.M., and the Special Meetings held July 10, 1998, at 9:30 A.M., and July 16, 1998, at 4:00 P.M., were approved.

(4) **PRESENTATION OF MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO THE MCALLEN VETERANS= ADMINISTRATION OUTPATIENT CLINIC FOR VETERANS**

Ms. Carmen Aguila, Care Transport, stated that there was a need for medical transportation of disabled veterans to the McAllen Outpatient Clinic and highlighted the functions and operations of their Program. She added that the veterans referred were transported at a special rate of \$15.00.

Commissioner Benavides moved that the presentation of Medical Transportation Service to the McAllen Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic for Veterans, be acknowledged.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

The Presentation Report is as follows:

(5) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING THE DEDICATION OF THE PORT ISABEL HEALTH CLINIC (TABLED)**

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, and seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, this Item was TABLED.

(7) **AUTHORIZATION OF THE TRANSFER OF A FORFEITED VEHICLE FROM THE CAMERON COUNTY CRIMINAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO THE LAGUNA VISTA POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, a forfeited vehicle from the Cameron County Criminal District Attorney was transferred to the Laguna Vista Police Department.

(8) **APPROVAL FOR THE PURCHASE OF A NEW COMMUNITY SERVICE VAN**

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, authorization to solicit bids for a new Community Service van was approved.

(9) **AUTHORIZATION TO ISSUE RENEWAL STATIONARY VENDOR PERMIT NO. V6 TO BRENNAN WELLS, DOING BUSINESS AS, WELLS BEACH RENTALS**

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Renewal Stationary Vendor Permit No. V6 was issued to Mr. Brennan Wells, doing business as, Wells Beach Rentals.

(10) **CONSIDERATION AND AUTHORIZATION TO ISSUE MOBILE VENDOR RENEWAL PERMIT NO. V9 TO ANTONIO QUIROZ, DOING BUSINESS AS, ALEXANDER-S ICE CREAM**

Commissioner Matz moved that Mobile Vendor Renewal Permit No. V9 be issued for Mr. Antonio Quiroz, doing business as, Alexander-s Ice Cream.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

(11) **AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH GUZMAN AND MUÑOZ ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING, INCORPORATED, FOR AN AREA PLANNING STUDY FOR THE DEL MAR HEIGHTS AND ARROYO COLORADO ESTATES COLONIAS (TCDP CONTRACT NO. 717185)**

Commissioner Benavides moved that a Professional Services Agreement with Guzman and Muñoz Engineering and Surveying, Incorporated, be negotiated for an Area Planning Study for the Del Mar Heights and Arroyo Colorado Estates Colonias, that being the Texas Community Development Program Contract No. 717185.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously.

(15) **APPROVAL OF AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE PASEO DE LA RESACA MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 3 FOR THE COLLECTION OF AD VALOREM TAXES**

Commissioner Benavides moved that the Inter -Government Agreement between Cameron County and the Paseo de la Resaca Municipal Utility District No. 3, for the collection of Ad Valorem Taxes, be approved.

The motion was seconded by commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

(16) **APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN SMITH KLINE CLINICAL LABORATORIES, INCORPORATED, AND THE CAMERON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Commissioner Matz moved that the Letter of Agreement between Smith Kline Clinical Laboratories, Incorporated, and the Cameron County Health Department, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE RECOMMENDED FOR ACONSENT® AND WERE EITHER RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD, WITHIN BUDGET OR AWARDED TO THE LOW BIDDER:

At this time, there was some discussion as to the travel policy regarding lunch expenses for in-County travel and Judge Hinojosa recommended that the County Auditor develop a policy including a lunch per diem for an employee attending an educational in-County Seminar.

Commissioner Matz expressed concern as to the hotel rates and mileage and suggested that the County Auditor review the issues to ensure consistency with the County Policy.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Consent Agenda Items were approved as follow:

(17) APPROVAL OF TRAVEL AND/OR TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR THE FOLLOWING, SUBJECT TO FUNDS IN THEIR BUDGET:

- a) Two (2) Deputy County Clerks to attend the Texas Year 2000 Workshop in Harlingen, Texas, on August 11, 1998;
- b) Chief Juvenile Probation Officer to attend the Texas Probation 1998 Legislative Conference in Lubbock, Texas, on August 21-26, 1998;
- c) Health Department employee to attend the 1998 Texas Nursing Law Course in McAllen, Texas, on July 24, 1998;
- d) County Extension Agent to attend the District 12 4-H Leadership Convention in Kingsville, Texas, on July 1, 1998;
- e) County Extension Program Assistant to attend the District 12 4-H Management Training Program in Kingsville, Texas, on July 6, 1998;
- f) Vehicle Maintenance Director to tour the Corpus Christi Independent School District and check the Software Programs in Corpus Christi, Texas, on July 23, 1998;
- g) Elections Administrator and four (4) Election Office Staff and Computer Center employee to attend the Secretary of State Sixteenth Annual Election Law Seminar in Austin, Texas, on August 18-21, 1998;
- h) Two (2) Health Department WIC employees to attend an Intensive Course in Breast-feeding Phase II in McAllen, Texas, on August 5-7, 1998;
- I) Sheriff's Department Lieutenant and Classification Officer to attend the Profiling the Sexually Violent Offender Seminar in Vernon, Texas, on July 28-31, 1998;
- j) County Engineer and Bridge Director to attend the Conference on Border Infrastructure Development and Bridge Crossings in Guadalajara, Mexico, on July 30-31, 1998; and
- k) County Clerk and two (2) Deputies to attend the Texas College of Probate Judges Annual Conference in Dallas, Texas, on September 9-12, 1998.

(18) AUTHORIZATION TO RENEW AWARD OF THE ANNUAL BIDS FOR ONE (1) ADDITIONAL YEAR

- a) **BID NO. 2100 BREAD**
BUTTER KRUST, San Antonio, Texas
- b) **BID NO. 2120 COFFEE**

SYSCO FOODS, San Antonio, Texas

- c) **BID NO. 2140 DRINK MIX**
 - a) **DISPENSER SERVICES, Schertz, Texas**
 - b) **CAIN-S COFFEE, Corpus Christi, Texas**
 - c) **SYSCO, San Antonio, Texas.**

- d) **BID NO. 2160 EGGS**
SYSCO FOODS, San Antonio, Texas

- e) **BID NO. 2180 MILK**
HYGEIA DAIRY, Harlingen, Texas

- f) **BID NO. 2200 PAN DULCE**
TONY-S TORTILLAS, Brownsville, Texas

- g) **BID NO. 2220 TAMALES**
LUPITA-S TORTILLAS, Brownsville, Texas

- h) **BID NO. 2240 TORTILLAS**
 - a) **MISSION TORTILLAS, Weslaco, Texas**
 - b) **LUPITA-S TORTILLAS, Brownsville, Texas**

- I) **BID NO. 2620 SAFETY SHOES**
REDWING SHOES, McAllen, Texas.

(19) **AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN THE HOUSTON GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATIVE PURCHASING**

(20) **AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN STATE OF TEXAS - DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATIVE PURCHASING**

(21) **AUTHORIZATION TO AWARD THE BID FOR ONE (1) VAN-JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

TIPTON FORD, Brownsville, Texas - \$19,766.00

(22) **AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN STATE OF TEXAS - GENERAL SERVICES COMMISSION COOPERATIVE STATE AND Q.E.S.V. CATALOG PURCHASING PROGRAM**

(23) **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

- a) **Precinct No. 4**

El Rosal Subdivision, Section III, Phase I - a replat of 4.040 acres out of Block No. 2, Minnesota-Texas Land and Irrigation Company Subdivision.

(24) PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL

a) Precinct No. 3

McClain Subdivision - being 10.00 acres, more or less, situated in a part of Block No. 96, Wilson Tract Subdivision; and

b) Precinct No. 3

Ted Hunt Estates - a 13.687 acres being all of Block AF[®], Resubdivision of Blocks No. 5 through No.8, inclusive of Unit 2 Extension of Bayview Citrus Groves Subdivision.

(25) EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Court met in Executive Session at 11:40 A.M. to discuss the following matters:

- a) Confer with County Counsel and outside Counsel regarding the Civil Action No. A-97-CA-699-SS, styled Young Sales Corporation, doing business as, Young Building Restoration vs. Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Cameron County, Texas, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, and Cause No. 97-08-5558-B, styled Cameron County, Texas, vs. Alpine Assurance, Limited, Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Gary L. Graf, pending in the 138th Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071 (1)(A);
- b) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Reymundo Varela vs. Cameron County, et. al., Cause No. 98-7-269-E, to discuss the state of the case and authorize the appointment of Counsel for the individual defendants; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071 (1)(A);
- c) Deliberation regarding the Real Property concerning Cameron County Trustee Lots, known as, Harlingen - Town Site, Lots No. 11 and No.12, Block No. 67; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072; and
- d) Deliberation regarding the Real Property concerning Cameron County Land, located at FM/511 and Old Alice Road; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

(1) EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a) Confer with Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel regarding the Agreement with Hunter Demolition to demolish bathroom facilities at Isla Blanca; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071(a).
- b) Confer with Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel regarding the Interlocal Agreement with South Padre Island for the County Parks Rangers to use South Padre Island's Jail Facilities; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071(2).

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz , seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Court reconvened in Regular Session at 12:18 P.M.

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA LEFT THE COURTROOM AT THIS TIME.

(26) ACTION RELATIVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a) Confer with County Counsel and outside Counsel regarding the Civil Action No. A-97-CA-699-SS, styled Young Sales Corporation, doing business as, Young Building Restoration vs. Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Cameron County, Texas, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, and Cause No. 97-08-5558-B, styled Cameron County, Texas, vs. Alpine Assurance, Limited, Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Gary L. Graf, pending in the 138th Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas.

Commissioner Matz moved that the Status Report by County Counsel be acknowledged regarding the Civil Action No. A-97-CA-699-SS, styled Young Sales Corporation, doing business as, Young Building Restoration vs. Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Cameron County, Texas, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, and Cause No. 97-08-5558-B, styled Cameron County, Texas, vs. Alpine Assurance, Limited, Historic Systems, Incorporated, and Gary L. Graf, pending in the 138th Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously,

- bb) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Reymundo Varela vs. Cameron County, et. al., Cause No. 98-7-269-E, to discuss the state of the case and authorize the appointment of Counsel for the individual defendants.

Commissioner Matz moved that the Status Report by County Counsel be acknowledged regarding the case styled Reymundo Varela vs. Cameron County, et. al., Cause No. 98-7-269-E, and that the appointment of Counsel for the individual defendants be authorized.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

- c) Deliberation regarding the Real Property concerning Cameron County Trustee Lots, known as, Harlingen - Town Site, Lots No. 11 and No. 12, Block No. 67.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property Management Coordinator, was instructed to accept the highest offers on the Cameron County Trustee Lots, known as, Harlingen - Townsite, Lots No. 11 and No. 12, Block No. 67.

- d) Deliberation regarding the Real Property concerning Cameron County Land, located at FM/511 and Old Alice Road.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Property Management Coordinator be instructed to negotiate the Lease with the General Services Commission and the State Comptroller's Office regarding the Cameron County Land, located at FM/511 and Old Alice Road.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

- a) In the matter to confer with Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel regarding the Agreement with Hunter Demolition to demolish bathroom facilities at Isla Blanca. **(TABLED)**

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, this Item was tabled.

- b) Confer with Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel regarding the Interlocal Agreement with South Padre Island for the County Parks Rangers to use South Padre Island's Jail Facilities.

Commissioner Peña moved that the County Judge and Commissioner Matz be authorized to schedule a meeting with the Mayor of South Padre Island to discuss the Interlocal Agreement with South Padre Island for the County Parks Rangers to use South Padre Island's Jail Facilities.

There being no further business to come before the Court, upon motion by Commissioner Peña , seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, the meeting was **ADJOURNED at 12:20 P. M.**

APPROVED this **8th** day of **September, 1998.**

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

ATTEST:

JOE G RIVERA
COUNTY CLERK AND EX-OFFICIO CLERK
OF THE COMMISSIONERS' COURT OF
CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS.