

THE STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF CAMERON

BE IT REMEMBERED on the 4th day of **SEPTEMBER, 2001**, 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:

5:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

PEDRO "PETE" BENAVIDES
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 1

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

DAVID A. GARZA
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 3

NATIVIDAD "TIVIE" VALENCIA
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 4

Mary Robles **Deputy Clerk**
COUNTY CLERK

ABSENT:

=====

The meeting was called to order by Judge Hinojosa, at 5:53 P.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 August 31, 2001, at 11:52 P. M., and the Supplemental Agenda posted on August 31, 2001 at 2:55 P.M.:

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS

(1) **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION HONORING MR. DANNY RIOS, MR. REYNALDO URISTA AND MR. REYNALDO SOSA, FOR THEIR RECENT ACTS OF HEROISM**

Constable Ramiro Sanchez, Precinct No. 6, explained that the young men, that being Mr. Reynaldo Urista, Mr. Danny Rios and Mr. Reynaldo Sosa, Los Fresnos students were members of the Constable- Precinct No. 6 Explorer Program, provided assistance after the school bus accident, and he expressed his appreciation for their heroic acts.

Mr. Eloy Cortez Jr., Los Fresnos Independent School District Board Secretary; Mr. Armin Argullin, Vice President; and Mr. James Guajardo, Board Member; commended the students, Constables, Sheriff-s Office, Emergency Medical Services and the Emergency Response Units for their participation and assistance after the school bus accident, adding that they were very grateful that no lives were lost.

At this time, Judge Hinojosa expressed his gratitude for the commendable efforts towards their fellow students and presented a Resolution to Mr. Rios, Mr. Urista and Mr. Sosa, Los Fresnos students, honoring their recent acts of heroism.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Resolution honoring Mr. Danny Rios, Mr. Reynaldo Urista and Mr. Reynaldo Sosa for their recent acts of heroism after the bus accident, be adopted.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

At this time, the following representatives from the Los Fresnos School District and surrounding community recognized the students, and presented them with gifts of appreciation for their commendable community service: Dr. Enrique Greigo - McAllen, Texas , Sgt. Arnold Flores - Sheriff-s Department; Mr. Raul Limon - Home Depot; Cardenas Motors; Mr. Sal Gonzalez - Albertsons; Zarsky-s; Lumber, Los Fresnos; Mr. Sergio Rodriguez - International Bank of Commerce; Fr. Armand Matthews - UTB-TSC; Wal Mart and Lone Star Bank.

The Resolution is as follows:

PRESENTATION

NOTE: Commissioner Benavides left the Meeting and Commissioner Garza joined the Meeting at this time.

(1) **PRESENTATION OF A RESOLUTION FROM THE CAMERON COUNTY JUVENILE BOARD TO THE COMMISSIONER'S COURT TO ACCEPT SALARY PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

Upon motion by Commissioner Valencia, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Resolution from the Cameron County Juvenile Board to the Commissioners= Court, to accept salary proposal submitted by the Juvenile Probation Department, was acknowledged.

The Resolution is as follows:

ACTION ITEMS

(2) APPROVAL OF BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Commissioner Cascos moved that the 2001 Fiscal Year Budget Amendment No. 2001-37, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

The Budget Amendments are follows:

(3) IN THE MATTER REGARDING MODIFICATIONS, ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS AT THE CAMERON COUNTY DETENTION FACILITY AND SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AND ISSUES RELATED THERETO (TABLED)

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, this Item was **TABLED**.

(4) IN THE MATTER REGARDING CAMERON COUNTY AND CITIES CHALLENGING CENSUS 2000 COUNTS AND ISSUES RELATED THERETO (TABLED)

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, this Item was **TABLED**.

(5) POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COUNTY TAX RATE FOR THE 2001-2002 FISCAL YEAR

Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, presented a notice of a Public Hearing to be held by Commissioners-Court, September 14, 2001, at 10:30 A. M., regarding the Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Tax Rate, to be published September 6, 2001.

Commissioner Cascos clarified that the tax rate to be published could not exceed but could be lower than said amount.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Publication Notice regarding the County Tax Rate for Fiscal Year 2001-2002, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

The Notice is as follows:

NOTE: Commissioner Benavides returned to the Meeting.

**(6) CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING
ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES AND
AUTHORIZATION TO PUBLISH NOTICE**

Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, requested direction from the Court as to the proposed compensation increases for Elected Officials for the publication notice, adding that the year before, the Court had decided to publish at zero increases and then the Elected Officials had grieved.

Judge Hinojosa stated that there was a recommendation that Justices of the Peace, Precinct Nos. 3-1 and Precinct No. 3-2 be paid at the same rate, that being the salary of \$35,300.00.

Commissioner Cascos questioned whether Justices of the Peace, Precinct Nos. 2-1 and Precinct No. 2-2 should be equalized, and suggested that the salaries be comparable to the salary of Constable Precinct No. 5. He added that what he wanted to do was to have the Constables that had comparable jurisdictions be at comparable salaries, and noted that there was no reason for Constable Precinct No. 2 to be below Constable Precinct No. 5.

Judge Hinojosa agreed and suggested that the Constable-s salary, Precinct No. 2, be increased to \$34,609.00.

There was some discussion and recommendations concerning the equalization of salaries for the Constables, Justices of the Peace, and District Clerk.

At this time, Judge Hinojosa recommended that the salaries for the District Clerk be set at \$60,472.00, Justices of the Peace for Precinct No. 2-2 be increased to \$38,280.00; Precinct No. 3-2 increased to \$35,330.00; and Constables Precincts Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 7 increased to \$33, 879.00; Constable Precinct No. 2 increased to \$34,609.00.

Commissioner Cascos clarified that Constables Precincts Nos. 5 and 6 would remain the same.

Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant, explained that in the grievance process, if the vote was nine to zero, the Court had to accept that recommendation; however, if it was not unanimous, but received an eight to one, or seven to two vote, the Court could consider the recommendation, but not accept it.

Judge Hinojosa recommended that if a four percent (4%) increase was approved, and the Elected Officials grieved, then the equalization would change, noting that all the grievance recommendations had been approved the previously.

Mr. Villarreal noted that there was a proposal to provide the employees a mobile phone allowance.

Commissioner Cascos asked the County Auditor how the matter would be addressed and stated that over budgeted mobile phone bills were being received each month.

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, responded that he had made a proposal that had been discussed before Commissioners= Court, and recommended to have an allowance of \$75.00 a month established and have the elected

officials address their own mobile phone issues.

Commissioner Cascos asked whether the document became a public or private document if they were allowed the \$75.00 allowance a month and if the governmental rate could be obtained on the individual's name.

Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners-Court Legal Counsel, stated that the issue had been discussed before and that any allowances had to be published.

Judge Hinojosa questioned whether the employees elected to reject the allowance, could they have the option of County phone.

Mr. Yates stated that elected officials could decline all or part of any increase.

Mr. Wright stated that elected officials could return part of their salary if they elected to do so and stressed that the issue was that if a phone allowance was to be given in the future it had to be included in the figure to be published.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that been done and to give them the option.

Mr. Yates stated that the publication included a phone and an auto allowance.

Mr. Villarreal stated that the Justices of the Peace that received auto allowance, had requested an increase.

Mr. Garza explained that the salaries would be determined on September 18, 2001, but that they could not exceed the amount published, adding that the salaries could be lowered. He added that after September 18, 2001, a letter would be distributed to the elected officials regarding the grievance process and the grievance hearing would be scheduled seven (7) to ten (10) days later.

Mr. Wright stated that the Court determined the salary at that point and that the time period allowed the public to express any concerns or complaints.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that a four percent (4%) compensation increase be published and questioned if it could be reduced when the Budget was determined. He stated that the last year it had been addressed and that the Court was informed that it could not be changed.

Mr. Garza stated that the Court would be locked into the rate after September 18, 2001, and what was being determined was the amount to be published in the notification to the public of the maximum amount.

Commissioner Cascos stated that it could be published at a four percent (4%) increase, yet on September 18, 2001; it could be decreased to a three percent (3%).

Mr. Garza agreed and added that they could additionally grieve for the amount they considered necessary.

Judge Hinojosa stated that he did not want a four percent (4%) increase.

Commissioner Cascos stated he did not want the four percent (4%) increase.

Commissioner Garza stated that he did not believe he had earned the increase.

Judge Hinojosa recommended a four percent (4%) increase for the elected officials, except for the Commissioner's Court, with the assumption that all employees receive a four percent (4%) increase, in addition to the salary increases to equalize everyone. He recommended that since the Justices of the Peace did their own inquests, that their auto allowance be increase from \$2,400.00 to \$2,800.00.

Commissioner Valencia suggested that Justices of the Peace for Precincts No. 7-1 and No. 7-2 be equalized and he requested the four percent (4%) increase due to being a full time Commissioner.

Judge Hinojosa clarified that the salaries for the County Clerk, excluding the County Judge and Commissioners for Precincts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, including Commissioner Precinct No. 4 and all employees down be recommended for a four (4) percent compensation increase, with the assumption that the employees received a four percent (4%) increase, the salaries to be equalized and the auto allowance to be set at \$2,800.00 per year.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the salaries for the County Clerk, excluding the County Judge and Commissioners for Precincts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, including Commissioner Precinct No. 4 and the remaining Officials be recommended for the proposed four percent (4%) increase, the salaries to be equalized and the auto allowance to be set at \$2,800.00 per year for the Justices of the Peace, be approved.

Mr. Villarreal requested clarification as to the mobile phones allowances.

Commissioner Cascos noted that the matter of mobile phone allowances or Astipends® needed to be determined, and withdrew his motion.

Discussion followed concerning the suggested amount of allowance, fees and minutes, and the suggestion was made to allow the employees the option of a County phone or an allowance.

Judge Hinojosa clarified the allowance be set in the amount of \$80.00 a month, or the County phone at the allocation presently obtained, adding that some elected officials obtained more minutes.

Mr. Yates stated that the officials would be requested to sign a deduction sheet that would allow over budgeted mobile phone expenditures to be deducted from their payroll checks.

Mr. Wright explained that the Notice to be published would include proposed salaries, expenses and allowances, adding that once the salaries were adopted, then the Elected Officials could grieve.

Commissioner Cascos moved that a four percent (4%) increase be approved for the Elected Officials beginning with the County Clerk, excluding the County Judge and Commissioners for Precincts Nos. 1, 2, and 3; including Commissioner Precinct No. 4, the salaries for the District Clerk be set \$60,472.00; Justices of the Peace Precinct No. 2-2 increased to \$38,280.00, and Precinct No. 3-2 increased to \$35,330.00; Constables Precincts Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 7 increased to \$33, 879.00 and Constable Precinct No. 2 increased to \$34,609.00; the auto allowance to be increased to \$2,800.00

per year for the Justices of the Peace; and the options of receiving a County mobile phone or an yearly allowance of \$960.00.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides.

Commissioner Garza clarified that the notice to be published was the maximum amount that could be increased for Elected Official-s salaries, including the four percent (4%) increase.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the salaries to be published would reflect the four percent (4%) increase to everyone, excluding Commissioners Precinct Nos. 1, 2, and 3, and the County Judge, the adjusted salary amounts as mentioned, the car allowances for the Justices of the Peace and the mobile phone allowance.

Ms. Aurora de la Garza, District Clerk, questioned whether an auto allowance was to be considered for the use of personal vehicles.

Commissioner Cascos noted that the District Clerk had a County vehicle, and that mileage reimbursement could be submitted.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the publication of the Elected Officials salaries were approved as follow: District Clerk increased to \$60,472.00; Justices of the Peace for Precinct No. 2-2 increased to \$38,280.00, Precinct No. 3-2 increased to \$35,330.00; Constables Precincts Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 7 increased to \$33, 879.00 and Constable Precinct No. 2 increased to \$34,609.00; a four percent (4%) increase for the Elected Officials beginning with the County Clerk, excluding the County Judge and Commissioners Precincts Nos. 1, 2, and 3; auto allowance to be increased to \$2,800.00 per year for the Justices of the Peace receiving auto allowances; and the options of receiving a County mobile phone or an allowance of \$960.00 a year.

At this time, Mr. Villarreal clarified that the Agenda Item No. 5 should be corrected to read 2001-2002 Fiscal Year.

The Salary Notice is as follows:

████████████████████

(7) **AUTHORIZATION TO SEND NOTICE OF TERMINATION TO BREEDEN McCUMBER GONZALEZ FOR THE ADVERTISEMENT CONTRACT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE SYSTEM**

Mr. Pete Sepulveda - AGood evening, Judge and Commissioners, we currently have an advertisement Contract with Breedon McCumber Gonzalez for outdoor billboard advertising. Looking at the revenues for this coming year, we are going to have to be really conservative, as a result of the slow down in the economy. This year we've had maquiladoras that have laid-off hundreds of employees and some of the major maquiladoras that we have in our accounts have reduced substantially because of the direct impact the economy has had on their operation. So, in an effort to generate additional revenues for the County, looking in our expenditure side, we have an advertising Contract that is costing \$72,000.00 annually, at this time. If we terminate the placement of the outdoor billboard signs, we can save that money that would go into the County's General Fund.

Judge Hinojosa - AThat's a direct transfer?@

Commissioner Valencia - ASo, that would be your recommendation?@

Judge Hinojosa - AThat would be an additional transfer?@

Mr. Sepulveda - ARight, that would be of savings.@

Commissioner Valencia - AOkay, so moved.@

Commissioner Cascos - AI have a couple of questions, someone, second it.@

Judge Hinojosa - ADid someone second it?@

Commissioner Cascos - ABut I have a couple of questions before you do this.@

Commissioner Valencia - AI made the motion.@

Judge Hinojosa - AMotion? Seconded by Commissioner Benavides.@

Commissioner Benavides - AI second it.@

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat I read in the paper, there was a forty percent (40%) increase in the Veterans Bridge revenues, is that correct or not?@

Mr. Sepulveda - AI think the increase that we've had at Veterans Bridge has been as a result of the transition of the commercial vehicles from the.@

Commissioner Cascos - AA simple >yes= or >no=. Is there a forty percent (40%) increase in the Veterans revenues that I read in the paper?@

Mr. Sepulveda - AWe've had an increase in crossings. I don't know if we've had a forty percent (40%) increase?@

Commissioner Cascos - AI think that's what the Judge indicated.®

Judge Hinojosa - AForty percent (40%) in the last three (3) years from the prior. The forty percent (40%) increase is an increase from the situation we had when we only had the Gateway Bridge. When we opened up the Los Tomates Bridge, the percentage of overall traffic in all three (3) bridges in Brownsville was forty percent (40%).®

Commissioner Cascos - AThen how can we have, if that is true, and I'm not disputing it, then how can we say that our revenues are down. Because of everything that is going on with the maquiladora business, if I'm just hearing that revenues are up.®

Judge Hinojosa - AWell, I project the revenues are up.®

Mr. Sepulveda - AWhen you look at it, the system as a whole, since we opened the bridge, then that happened. We've had a higher increase than forty percent (40%).®

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat happened?®

Mr. Sepulveda - AWhen you look at it, this fiscal year compared to the last fiscal year then that's a different story.®

Commissioner Cascos - AWhy is this a surprise? We've been saying that the last six (6) months. That our projections at the Bridge System were not meeting what we thought. As a matter of fact, when we renewed this contract in April, I think Commissioner Garza, you know, I think questioned it. I think the idea was, Oh well, let's go another year and see what happens and now six (6) months into it, all of a sudden somebody's light goes on and figures out that our revenues are down, and if I remember the advertising, this is strictly for the Veterans Bridge advertising. I think these billboards, right?®

Mr. Sepulveda - ANo, we've got all three (3) bridges.®

Commissioner Cascos - AOh, they are? The ones I'm seeing are Veterans Bridge. I don't know, the blue ones. So, I'm just a little bit dismay as to April when we renewed this thing. Now, reducing this Contract is not going to increase your revenues, it may reduce your expenditures. But it is not going to increase your revenues. The other question I have is that....®

Judge Hinojosa - AWhat's the difference?®

Commissioner Cascos - AThe difference is, it's two (2) different things. If your doing it to cut expenses, that's an issue.®

Mr. Sepulveda - AOh, and by reducing expenditures we'll increase the amount of revenues that's going to transfer.®

Commissioner Cascos - AIs that going to automatically transfer to a thirty six (36) thousand dollar increase to the General Fund?@

Judge Hinojosa - AYes.@

Commissioner Cascos - AHas that number already been looked at? So we're saying that, whatever you are going to transfer, you are going to add \$36, 00.00 to that transfer?@

Mr. Sepulveda - AIf this takes place, yes.@

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay, now the other question is. I don't have a copy of the Contract, there's a summary like a standard agency letter of agreement, but has legal looked at this Contract to see if we can, or is it a thirty (30) day out, sixty (60) day out? Have you looked at it?@

Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel - AI've looked at the Contract. There is no non-appropriation provision in it.@

Commissioner Cascos - AI don't know what that means.@

Mr. Wright - AWell, there is not a clause that in effect says or pre-notifies the vendor, that if there is no revenues appropriated for the expenditure, based on fiscal year, there is an automatic right of the County to withdraw the Contract. There is no such provision in this.@

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat does that tell me?@

Judge Hinojosa - AIt means that we can terminate, if we want to.@

Mr. Wright - AWell.@

Commissioner Cascos - AI'd like to hear it from him.@

Mr. Wright - AThe rule is when you deal with County, they can't appropriate monies beyond the Fiscal Year.@

Commissioner Cascos - ABut we have fiscal year Contracts all the time. We have Contracts all the time that go from one year to the next. So we're saying that we're going to cancel it six (6) months into the year.

Mr. Wright - AWe can, yes.@

Commissioner Cascos - AI don't know. I'm asking because the Contract isn't here. I've got a problem. You know, a few months ago you proposed it, we did it, you should have known that our revenues were not meeting the projections. By God, I think Mark has been saying it, I've been saying it. We decided to do this another year, now six (6) months into the deal, let's cut it, because \$36,000.00 is going to make or break this thing. I have a real problem with this, Pete. Because why did we enter in April, if we knew in April that we were not meeting our projections. The same question I asked about the maquiladoras and the Tax Abatements that we gave. We did it, predicated on certain crossings

and certain number of crossings. Where are we with that? Are they meeting those crossing expectations that we have?

And if they are not, are we going to go back and review this now about, with the abatements that we have?@

Judge Hinojosa - AWhat do you want to do with the abatements?@

Commissioner Cascos - AI don't know, you tell me.@

Judge Hinojosa - AWell, what do you mean by the abatement agreement. Do you want to eliminate the abatements?@

Commissioner Garza - AYes.@

Commissioner Cascos - AIf they are not meeting what they were obligated to meet, shouldn't we?@

Judge Hinojosa - AYou want to see if we can go back, are you proposing that we go back to the abatements and eliminate the abatements?@

Commissioner Cascos - AYes, if they are not meeting their crossings that they said. We gave the abatements, it was, if I remember right, it was done because they committed to do a certain number of crossings. Is that correct?@

Mr. Sepulveda - ACorrect, but...@

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay.@

Judge Hinojosa - AAre we talking about the abatements at the Free Trade Bridge, right?@

Commissioner Cascos - AWhoever it is that we gave the abatements.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AThe only...@

Mr. Wright - ALet's set this for discussion at a time the public has seen this.@

Commissioner Cascos - AThat's fine. Let me, I've got a problem with this, Okay, reducing it for the reason that are being presented, that \$36,000.00 is going to somehow, bail us out of some concerns. \$36,000.00 is a lot of money. But without even looking at the Contract, I've just got an Agreement here. I think somebody should have looked at this in April, when he came and asked for an extension of this Contract, you know.@

Judge Hinojosa - AWell, I think you forget, Commissioner, when we took it up last time, David raised the issue as to whether we needed this, and I think his question was >do we need it and can we afford it?=-I think that's exactly what he questioned. Why do we need to do this, and the response was let's do it right now and then we'll reexamine it at the beginning of the next Fiscal Year, that's what the response was. We are in the new Fiscal Year. We've got a tight budget, we've got a million dollar short fall in the Health Insurance Fund, we've been trying to get every bit of money that we can put together to try and see if we can balance this budget and at the same time give the employees the four percent (4%) increase and do what we need to be able to insure that we operate this properly.@

Commissioner Cascos - AJudge, I just.@

Judge Hinojosa - AWhy do we need that?@

Commissioner Cascos - ANo, I just don't recall that being said.@

Judge Hinojosa - AThat is exactly what was said.@

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat I recall. No, no, Judge. If that would have been the case, we would have done a six (6) month Contract. But what I recall was, let's do it another year, not the end of the Fiscal Year, let's do it another year and then evaluate it.@

Judge Hinojosa - AThat's not what I remember.@

Commissioner Cascos - AI don't know, that's my recollection, Commissioner Garza, I think, was the one that brought up the comment. That's my recollection.@

Commissioner Garza - AMy questioning was just the expense that we had, and Pete you stood there and told me those billboards generated traffic for our bridges. That it brought people across the bridges that might possibly not go across the bridge, because they saw those billboards and that they were increasing the revenues in our three (3) different bridges.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AThat's correct.@

Commissioner Garza - AOkay, that's what I was told. And I went ahead and said, well if that's the case, I have absolutely no problem supporting that, and I still don't have a problem supporting it. If it helps keep the bridges a viable entity for us, I think it needs to be there. If there are personal reasons why this Contract is being terminated, I have a real problem with that. Because, if we have a Contract with a company, and we are not living up to the obligations that we have as a County, you know, that is wrong, and should not be done.@

Judge Hinojosa - AWe have a Contract that Counsel from Commissioners=Court directly is telling us that we can terminate. So.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AWhat I mentioned, when we brought this back in March or April, was that because of the retail development that was going on along the expressway corridor, that it might help to have them up. Since that time, as I mentioned before, we've had maquilas laying-off hundreds of employees, we've had maquilas continuing to decrease in the number of crossings, and.... This time like you said, I don't think that, the revenues side of the equation is going to go much higher than we are projecting right now.@

Commissioner Garza - Athat's what I said back in April.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AI'm sorry.@

Commissioner Garza - AThat's what I said back in April. I said if there are only three (3) bridges, what choices do people have?@

Judge Hinojosa - ABut, let me correct you. You didn't support it, you voted against it. So.®

Commissioner Garza - ANo, I didn't vote against, I voted for it, Judge.®

Judge Hinojosa - AWell, I've got the Minutes right here.®

Commissioner Garza - AYes.®

Judge Hinojosa - AAnd the Minutes say Commissioner Garza >say=.®

Commissioner Cascos - AMaybe it was an >abstention=.®

Commissioner Garza - AIt could have been an >abstention® you know, and you wrote it down as a >say=.®

Commissioner Cascos - ABut what does it say? Do the Minutes also say it was for the end of the Fiscal Year or what does it say?®

Commissioner Garza - ABut again, though. What does it say on there?®

Judge Hinojosa - AIt just says that the renewal of the Contract for the placement of outdoor billboards for the International Bridge System be approved.®

Commissioner Garza - AAnd I voted >say=?®

Judge Hinojosa - AAnd you voted >say=. No. It doesn't say anything about what time?®

Mr. Wright - ALet me make sure you are all...®

Judge Hinojosa - AOh, for an additional year, yes.®

Commissioner Garza - AFor an additional year, right.®

Commissioner Cascos - ANot the fiscal year, an additional year, so...Okay, that was my memory, but you know.®

Mr. Wright - AIf you do this though, you are in effect, from a policy stand point, saying to him, there won't be money spent for this purpose, you are not going to be appropriating money for this purpose next year.®

Judge Hinojosa - AI don't think we should. I don't think, with the budget we have this year, we should be spending money for billboards to advertise. Now, in a situation where we are facing a budgetary short fall, with all the additional expenditures that we've got. I mean, you know, every department needs to be asked to cut as much as possible, a lot of people are being asked to sacrifice, and this is just one additional thing where a transfer would make a difference. If you want to come back Commissioner Cascos, and as you mentioned earlier, and recommend that we reexamine the abatements on the other bridges, then you need to put it on the agenda.®

Commissioner Cascos - AI just think that we honor the contracts that we have. Unless there is some overwhelming reason for canceling it, I just don't see that, with this. I really don't.®

Commissioner Valencia - AI get the point right here Commissioners, besides what I am seeing, is that Pete is asking us to terminate this Contract, because that would probably give us over \$72,000.00 savings.®

Commissioner Cascos - ANo, no, no, \$36,000.00.@

Judge Hinojosa - AHalf of that, the thirty six (36,) yes.@

Commissioner Valencia - AOkay, \$36,000.00, and I guess that's the point that I will see. If it is going to be a savings to the County and we don't actually need those advertisers, at this point in time, I will support that. And that is why I made my motion.@

Commissioner Cascos - ALet me ask a question, have you turned in your budget, already?@

Mr. Sepulveda - AYes.@

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay, and when did you do that?@

Mr. Sepulveda - AIn the beginning of July, I believe.@

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay, and in that budget did you reduce the advertising expense by \$72,000.00.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AThat time I didn't, no.@

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay, so you are saying that just came up, recently?@

Mr. Sepulveda - ANo, I've been meeting with the Budget Officer, the last three (3), four (4) weeks to look at our revenues, as I mentioned. Our revenues, we have to budget as conservative as we need to.@

Commissioner Cascos - AYou couldn't project out the revenues thirty (30) days ago? I've been telling you, that we are going to have a short fall and you couldn't...@

Mr. Sepulveda - AWell...@

Judge Hinojosa - AI don't think, wait a minute. I don't think a year since I've been County Judge, I don't think a year has gone by where I haven't told Pete, see if you can find some more money in the budget. Correct me if I'm wrong.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AThat's correct, and the reason that.. .@

Judge Hinojosa - AEvery single year he submits his projected revenues complete with a transfer from the bridge, and every single year I sit down with him and I say, Pete, find some more money, because we need some more money to be transferred into the General Fund. Every single year I tell him, and every single year he goes back and tries to figure out what he can cut and what he can live with and that's exactly the way it works all the time, and there's no difference this year than what it's ever been.@

Mr. Sepulveda - AI started looking at the projections since June. But then at the end of every month, I go back and look to see if the figures have gone up for passenger vehicles or for commercial vehicles, and if they do and if Mark agrees we adjust those figures, if they don't, we don't.@

Commissioner Cascos - AHow much of a short fall are we having this coming fiscal year?@

Judge Hinojosa - AAbout a million dollars.@

Commissioner Cascos - ANo, no, I'm talking about in the Bridge System.®

Judge Hinojosa - AWait a minute. We're not talking about a short fall in the Bridge System, we're talking about a short fall in the Budget of the County, where we've had all this expenditures and one of the top income producer for the County is the Bridge System, that's what we're talking about.®

Commissioner Cascos - AWell, let me ask.®

Judge Hinojosa - AAnd he brings in money to be transferred over. If we didn't have the money coming in from the Bridge System, to the extent that it comes in today, and the revenues were not coming in today, we would not be able to keep the lowest tax rate in all of South Texas.®

Commissioner Cascos - ALet me ask the question again, how much are your revenue projections down on the Bridge System?®

Mr. Sepulveda - AAs far as actual revenues to budgeted revenues at the last quarter, we were off by \$99,000.00. So, I'm not sure if the next three (3) months we're going to zero out or if we're going to be off.®

Commissioner Cascos - ABut, this is nothing new, I mean. We know that we've had some projected short falls.®

Mr. Sepulveda - ALike, I said, at the end of the third quarter we were off by \$99,000.00 and that represents one percent (1%) of the budgeted revenues.®

Commissioner Cascos - AThat's on the revenues, right?®

Mr. Sepulveda - AThat's combined revenues and expenditures.®

Commissioner Cascos - AAnd we didn't know that in April when we approved this new contract?®

Mr. Sepulveda - AWell, as I mentioned, you know, since that time, we've had the continued lay offs, we've had the continued declines in the crossings. You know, I couldn't predict six months ago, if the economy would improve or not.®

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat other areas are you adjusting in the Budget.®

Mr. Sepulveda - AThat's pretty much the only big line item that I have, you know. The majority of our expenditures are personnel expenditures.®

Commissioner Cascos - AWhat other? So your not adjusting any other line item significantly, other than this one?®

Mr. Sepulveda - AThis is the only big line item that I have.®

Commissioner Cascos - AOkay.®

Judge Hinojosa - AAlright, any further discussion?®

Commissioner Garza - AI still say, Judge, that we should honor, regardless of how I voted, if we have a contract we should honor the contract, as a County. I mean, if I were the owner of a company, and I went into contract with you in good faith, I would expect for that contract to be honored.®

Judge Hinojosa - AAll of our contracts have thirty (30) day out clauses. Every single one we are able to get out and we have in the past. This is not any different. Alright, all those in....®

Mr. Wright - AJudge, let me make something clear. I think when I explained the equation, he also didn't understand. I reviewed this, when it was brought in, what, within the last two (2) weeks. There is a not a thirty (30) day out clause on this, there is not a non appropriation provision. I know for a fact, I did not review this when it was approved. I think that perhaps Dylbia did, but for some reason a non appropriation provision was not put into this. Basic rule though is, when you deal with governmental entity, anyone who deals with them as a vendor, knows that if you don't budget monies, the governmental entity can't pay. And although, I like to put it into the contract, just by way of notice to anyone who deals with us. Everyone has to know, when you deal with governmental entities, if there's no monies appropriated for the fiscal year, the monies are not there, so.®

Judge Hinojosa - AOkay.®

Commissioner Garza - AAnd my only concerns is that some signs, I mean, if these are highway signs that you are looking at, when you buy time on these signs, when companies buy time on these signs, they usually contract time on those things. It's not like a thirty (30) day out on a contract that they have with the sign companies.®

Judge Hinojosa - AAlright, all those in favor signify by stating Aaye.®

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Valencia, seconded by Commissioner Benavides, that notice of termination be sent to Breeden McCumber Gonzalez, for the advertisement contract for the International Bridge System, carried as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Benavides and Valencia and Judge Hinojosa,

NAY: Commissioners Cascos and Garza.



[REDACTED]

(8) APPROVAL TO SUBMIT A GRANT FOR \$150,000.00 FOR 2001-2002 SUPPORTING THE UNIDOS PODEMOS JUVENILE FORENSIC TRAINING LAB

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, explained that the Unidos Podemos Board had elected to form a non profit corporation, which could be done in two (2) weeks and that the process to receive a 501C-3 designation would take approximately 128 days, according to an IRS ruling, and after that, the Program could operate on its own.

Judge Hinojosa clarified that the Court was concerned with the lack of organization and that there was no formal structure or accountability to the County. He noted that he had met with Ms. Joan Macrum, Chief Juvenile Officer, Mr. George Samano, Unidos Podemos; and several other persons involved, for the past six (6) months, adding that the County was told that the issue would be resolved and it never was.

Mr. Yates stated that every Grant had been presented, with the County as a Fiscal Agent, before Commissioners' Court for approval.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the issue was to clarify what was being done and that the he had no problem with being the Fiscal Agent for said organization, as long as there was a time line when the responsibility would be transferred over to Unidos Podemos.

Mr. Yates stated that he had been informed that they would file for a non profit corporation within the next month and he anticipated obtaining their non profit status with Internal Revenue Service (IRS) within 128 days. He reported that there were three (3) grants, two (2) that had expired and one (1) extending throughout November 30, 2001, adding that he expected that the non profit status would be in effect by that time. Mr. Yates explained that some of the grants needed a local government sponsor to apply for them, and that if the grant was to be awarded to a non governmental agency, request for proposals would be required, unless there was another legal arrangement established.

Judge Hinojosa stated that he had no problem with that recommendation, and requested direction from legal counsel.

Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners-Court Legal Counsel, stated that it was his understanding that the issue was whether the application for the Grant needed to be made.

Mr. Yates explained that the particular grant involved the County and UTMB and that an Interlocal Agreement could be made.

Dr. Roberta E. Dahl, Unidos Podemos, explained that the grants were from the federal government and that they wanted the governmental entity to run with the community coalition. She stated that they are requiring that the fiscal

agent be either the County or City and they are requiring that they run with the community coalition that acts as an advisor, or you can't apply for these funds.®

Mr. Wright stated that the application required a 501C-3 designation.

Dr. Dahl stated that the qualifications were that they set up a coalition structure requiring the following: at least twenty one (21) members representing certain areas, for examples; health, law enforcement, etc.; that they meet every month, that they have a five (5) year plan, approved by the Governor's Office and Comprehensive Strategy, and some basic criteria that had to be met in order to apply for the monies. She noted that one of the criteria was that they operate with the City or the County.

Mr. Yates recommended that the County apply for the grant, adding that he believed that they would file for a non profit status, and that every decision regarding the grant would be brought before Commissioners= Court for approval. He emphasized that everything had been presented to the Court for approval, and that the Property Manager had been involved with the selection of the location that was being leased.

Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant, stated that the process would be that the Judge-s Office received notification of the approval of the grant and that the Court would review the Contract for approval, adding that the Court could decline to accept the award, at the time.

Commissioner Cascos requested that the Property Manager be asked to clarify the issue of the location, and the suggestion was made to delay action until the Property Manager could be summoned.



(9) **AUTHORIZATION FOR CAMERON COUNTY PARKS SYSTEM, CENTRO CULTURAL, TO GIVE A LICENSE TO THE GOOD NEIGHBOR SETTLEMENT HOUSE FOR THE USE OF TEN (10) COMPUTERS**

Mr. Javier Mendez, Parks System Director, stated that they had wanted to donate the ten (10) outdated computers, which were donated by Texas A&M, but that since the donation could not take place, they were requesting to enter into a License Agreement with the Good Neighbor Settlement Home. He noted that the matter was discussed with Texas A&M, and they had no problem with the donation.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Cameron County Parks System Centro Cultural, be authorized to give a license to the Good Neighbor Settlement House for the use of ten (10) Computers.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides.

At this time, there was some discussion concerning the process needed for the County to make a donation, and the alternative of allowing the use of the computers, but not actually donating the computers.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, Cameron County Parks System Centro Cultural, was authorized to give a License to the Good Neighbor Settlement House for the use of ten (10) computers.

(8) **APPROVAL TO SUBMIT A GRANT FOR
\$150,000.00 FOR 2001-2002, SUPPORTING THE
UNIDOS PODEMOS JUVENILE FORENSIC
TRAINING LAB**

Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/Airport Manager, reported that the matter of the Lease Agreement was reviewed and discussed several times with Mr. George Samano, Unidos Podemos, adding that it had been signed by Judge Hinojosa and attested by Joe G. Rivera, County Clerk, on September 5, 2000.

Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant, stated that the Minutes would be reviewed to verify that the Item had been submitted for the Court or the Judge's approval.

Mr. Yates stated it had been brought before the Court as everything else and recommended that the application be made.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Grant Application for \$150,000.00 for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 be submitted, supporting the Unidos Podemos Juvenile Forensic Training Lab, with the understanding that every decision regarding the grant be brought before Commissioners= Court for approval.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza.

Dr. Susan Ritter, University of Texas of Brownsville/Unidos Podemos Board, stated that the grant was a viable source of funding for equipment and provided for twelve (12) college credits hours.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the matter regarding submission of a grant application for \$150,000.00 for Fiscal Year 2001-2002, supporting the Unidos Podemos Juvenile Forensic Training Lab was approved, with the understanding that every decision regarding the grant be brought before Commissioners= Court for approval.

The Application is as follows:

(10) ACTION AUTHORIZING THE TRADING OF WEAPONS PURCHASED WITH FORFEITURE MONEY

Captain Robert Lopez, Sheriff's Department, requested Court approval to trade seven (7) sub machine guns that had been bought with drug forfeiture monies in the late 1980's, adding that they were trading them for thirty three (33) block forties (40) guns. He stated that ten (10) other guns had been purchased and that the trade would result in savings to the County, in the amount of approximately \$14,000.00.

Judge Hinojosa clarified that the gun trader was authorized to trade and negotiate only with law enforcement agencies.

Commissioner Valencia moved that the trading of weapons purchased with forfeiture money, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza.

There was some discussion concerning the availability of drug forfeiture monies in the Sheriff-s budget for gun purchases, and Captain Lopez noted that there were no monies available and that only two (2) dispatcher position were currently being funded with said monies.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Valencia, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the trading of weapons purchased with forfeiture money was approved, with the stipulation that whatever was being traded would not be utilized by anyone, other than law enforcement agencies.

(11) AUTHORIZATION TO GRANT A 5.0 FOOT EASEMENT TO JESSICA GONZALEZ FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A WATER LINE

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously, the a 5.0 foot easement to Jessica Gonzalez for the installation of a water line was granted.

(12) ACTION REGARDING THE CLEAN UP OF THE MAIN DRAINAGE DITCH BEHIND FLORIDA ROAD BRIDGE

Mr. Juan Bernal, County Engineer-Public Works Director, reported that the ownership of the main drain was unclear after researching the matter, adding that Drainage District No. 2 no longer existed, and that the Irrigation District had taken over the maintenance of the ditch and easement.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that the work be done as recommended by the County Engineer in order to prevent flooding in the areas.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the clean up of the main drainage ditch behind Florida Road Bridge, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza.

Commissioner Garza questioned the memorandum from Ms. Blanca Betancourt, County Engineers Office, stating that the Irrigation District would be restricted to working on irrigation canals as of September 1, 2001.

Mr. Bernal stated that State law prevented the Irrigation District to carry out additional maintenance of said ditch and that most likely the County would have to maintain it, noting that he would discuss the matter with the Irrigation District.

Commissioner Cascos questioned how other drainage ditches that had no one to take responsibility for them would be addressed.

Judge Hinojosa noted that \$300,000.00 had recently been utilized for the drainage ditch in Valle Escondido.

Mr. Bernal stated that the drainage ditch in question was the main ditch that carried most of the water in the Brownsville area.

Commissioner Cascos asked if the equipment was available and Mr. Bernal responded that he needed to rent a drag line, in the approximate cost of \$7,000.00 to \$9,000.00, and would need to utilize two (2) operators.

Upon motion duly made by Judge Hinojosa, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the clean up of the main drainage ditch behind Florida Road Bridge was approved.

[REDACTED]

(13) POSSIBLE ACTION ON INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE CITY OF PORT ISABEL CONCERNING EXPANSION OF THE PORT ISABEL CEMETERY

Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners-Court Legal Counsel, explained that there were specific statutes concerning that for historical purposes, health, safety or welfare, Commissioners-Court could use public funds, County employees, and equipment to maintain a cemetery that had grave markers more than fifty (50) years old.

Mr. Silvestre Garcia, Judge Hinojosa's Office, stated that the City of Port Isabel requested the use of equipment from the County.

Mr. Wright recommended an Interlocal Agreement, adding that the only equipment involved was from the Road and Bridge. He noted that the monetary limit was under \$ 3,000.00 and that the scheduling of equipment and personnel should not interfere with the Public Works schedule.

Commissioner Valencia moved that an Interlocal Agreement between Cameron County and the City of Port Isabel, concerning expansion of the Port Isabel Cemetery, be approved.

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, questioned whether Aexpansion@ meant Amaintenance@, and Judge Hinojosa responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Garza questioned whether any cemetery having a marker over fifty (50) years old could request the County to assist in the maintenance.

Mr. Frank Martinez, District Attorney, noted that the Item was regarding an expansion of a city cemetery and not maintenance of it.

Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant, noted that it could be classified as historical preservation.

At this time, Commissioner Valencia suggested that the item be tabled.

There was some discussion concerning whether burials would continue and whether burial plots were sold, and Commissioner Valencia withdrew his original motion and moved that this Item be **TABLED**.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cascos, and the vote was as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Cascos and Valencia,

NAY: Commissioners Benavides and Garza and Judge Hinojosa.

Commissioner Garza moved that the Interlocal Agreement between Cameron County and the City of Port Isabel, concerning expansion of the Port Isabel Cemetery, be approved.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides and Garza and Judge Hinojosa,

NAY: Commissioner Valencia and Cascos.

The Agreement is as follows:

(14) **CONSIDERATION AND SELECTION OF
EVALUATION COMMITTEE ON PROPOSAL FOR
THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATION FOR SECTION
IRC 125 AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT
SPECIFICATIONS, WHICH MAY REQUIRE OPEN
AND CLOSED SUPPLEMENTAL POLICIES
PROVIDERS**

Judge Hinojosa moved that the following seven (7) persons be appointed to the Evaluation Committee for the Third Party Administration for Section IRC 125 proposals, and flexible spending account specifications which may require open and closed supplemental policies: Mr. Manuel Villarreal, Personnel Director; Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, or his designee; Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel; Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant; Sheriff Conrado Cantu, Cameron County Sheriff, or his designee; Mr. Joe G. Rivera, Cameron County Clerk, or his designee; and Mr. Pete Sepulveda, International Bridge System Director.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously.

(15) **APPROVAL FOR THE POLLING PLACES FOR
THE NOVEMBER 6, 2001, CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT ELECTION**

Commissioner Garza moved that the polling places for the November 6, 2001, Constitutional Amendment Election be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

The Polling Places are as follow:

CONSENT ITEMS

ALL ITEMS UNDER THE CONSENT AGENDA ARE HEARD COLLECTIVELY UNLESS OPPOSITION IS PRESENTED, IN WHICH CASE THE CONTESTED ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED, DISCUSSED, AND APPROPRIATE ACTION TAKEN SEPARATELY.

DISCUSSION CONCERNING CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, requested Warrant No. 000601931, payable to Southwest Keys, be withdrawn for verification.

ITEM NO. 32 - Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, requested clarification as to the vehicle to be purchased for Constable Jose A. Jimenez, Precinct No. 7. He noted that a 4x4 vehicle would cost \$19,047.00, and that lease financing would be obtained, and that a regular pick-up would cost of \$16,109.00. Commissioner Valencia recommended to award a four wheel drive (4x4) vehicle to Constable Jose A. Jimenez, Precinct No. 7.

ITEM NO. 33 Af@ - Judge Hinojosa questioned the need of the Administrative Assistant for Commissioner's Precinct No. 3, to attend the training and questioned who he supervised. Commissioner Garza stated that according to the pamphlet, it would benefit the individual. Judge Hinojosa noted he would not support the item at the cost of \$337.00. Commissioner Valencia stated he would not support the item.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the following AConsent@ Agenda Items be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the motion on the floor be amended to exclude Travel Item 33 Af@.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides and Valencia, and Judge Hinojosa,

NAY: Commissioners Cascos and Garza.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the AConsent@ Agenda Items, excluding Travel Item No. 33 Af@, be approved as follows:

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Garza, Valencia and Judge Hinojosa,

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Cascos as to the Minutes of August 14, 2001.

(16) APPROVAL OF CLAIMS;

Additional late claim:

Warrant No. 00061974, as to Brownsville Business, in the amount \$902.15.

(17) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) August 14, 2001-Regular.

- (18) **AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE 23 COMPUTERS FROM CDW-G, UTILIZING STATE OF TEXAS GENERAL SERVICE COMMISSION;**
- (19) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE CAMERON COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES DISTRICT NO. 1, TO PROVIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002;**
The Amendment follows:
- (20) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE CAMERON COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES DISTRICT NO. 1, TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY SERVICES CONSULTING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002;**
The Amendment follows:
- (21) **AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT FOR RESIDENTIAL CHILD CARE SERVICE FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT;**
The Contract follows:
- (22) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR FAMILY HEALTH, TO PROVIDE TITLE V MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES IN CAMERON COUNTY;**
The Contract follows:
- (23) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR FAMILY HEALTH TO PERFORM PUBLIC HEALTH PREVENTIVE SERVICES RELATED TO WOMEN, CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES;**
The Contract follows:
- (24) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES WITH MR. ARMANDO R. VILLALOBOS, TO PROVIDE LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO THE INDIGENT DEFENDANTS OF THE 404TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT;**
The Contract follows:
- (25) **AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT RESACA VISTA DRIVE, PRECINCT NO. 3, IN LA RESACA COUNTRY ESTATE, PHASE I SUBDIVISION, INTO THE COUNTY ROAD SYSTEM;**
- (26) **AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT LANTANA LAKE DRIVE IN NORTH LANTANA, UNIT II SUBDIVISION, PRECINCT NO. 3, INTO THE COUNTY ROAD SYSTEM;**
- (27) **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL:**
 - a) **Precinct No. 2 - Rio Bravo Section No. 8 Subdivision - Being 5.85 acres out of Lot No. 1, Block No. 15, Rio Bravo Subdivision.**
- (28) **PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL:**
 - a) **Precinct No. 3 - Tandy's Corner Replat Phase No. 1a Subdivision-Being a Resubdivision of Lot Nos. 8 -14, Block No. 2 Reserve Area "B", Lot No. 1, Block No. 3, and 100ft. drainage ditch easement, Tandy's Corner Subdivision.**
- (29) **AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) NO. 010903 FOR FUEL SITE (S) MODIFICATION/UPGRADES AND APPROVAL OF EVALUATION COMMITTEE;**
- (30) **RENEW AND AWARD THE FOLLOWING BIDS/ PROPOSALS FOR ONE (1) ADDITIONAL YEAR:**
 - a) **Road Signs, Post and Misc. - Annual Bid No. 2630**

VULCAN SIGNS, Foley, Alabama - \$12,571.00

- b) **Office Supplies - Annual Bid No. 2440**
CORPORATE EXPRESS, Brownsville, Texas - \$48,835.62, and
T.C.P.N. REGION IV (OFFICE DEPOT), Houston, Texas \$48,423.53.
 - c) **Linens - Annual Bid No. 2360,**
 - a) **Mattress - BOB BARKER, Fuquay-Varina, N. C. - \$29.95**
 - b) **Mattress covers - CHARM TEX, Brooklyn, N.Y. - \$4.50**
 - c) **Blankets -HARBOR LINENS, Cherry Hill, N. J. - \$5.29, and**
 - d) **Towels - ACME SUPPLY, Port Washington, N.Y. - \$0.70.**
 - d) **Food (tortillas -Corn/Flour) - Annual Bid No. 2240.**
NANCY TORTILLAS - Brownsville, Texas \$0.0113.
- (31) **TO AWARD BIDS FOR FOUR (4) TRUCKS - VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS**
Item A - **RODRIGUEZ FORD, Raymondville, Texas - \$15,860**
Item B - **PHILPOTT FORD, Port Neches, Texas - \$31,112**
Item C - **TIP-O-TEX CHEV, Brownsville, Texas - \$14,034, and**
Item D - **PHILPOTT FORD, Port Neches, Texas - \$19,888.**
- (32) **APPROVAL OF PURCHASE WITHOUT PURCHASE ORDER TO UNITED MEDICAL SUPPLY, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$205.66.**

TRAVEL ITEMS

- (33) **AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL/OR APPROVAL OF TRAVEL EXPENSE FOR THE FOLLOWING (PLEASE NOTE: TRAVEL REQUESTS ARE SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE COUNTY POLICIES):**
- a) 197th District Judge to attend a course entitled AJudicial Writing at the University of Nevada@, in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 7- 12, 2001;
 - b) County Court at Law No. 2 Judge to attend the A12-Hour of Continuing Judicial Education Course@, in Houston, Texas, September 23-26, 2001;
 - c) District Attorney to attend the ACOBIJA IX Operational Planning Conference 2001@, in San Diego, California, September 24-25, 2001;
 - d) Assistant County Auditor to attend the A2001 Indigent Health Care Conference@, in Austin, Texas, October 9-12, 2001;
 - e) Three Health Department employees (3) to attend the ASecond Annual Graduation Ceremony honoring the 2001 Indigent Health Care Conference@, in Austin, Texas, September 14, 2001;
 - f) In the matter of Commissioner Precinct No. 3 Administrative Assistant to attend the ACertificate Program in Management@, in Harlingen, Texas, September 5, 12, 19, and 26, 2001; (EXCLUDED)
 - g) Eight (8) Sheriff-s Deputies to attend the A2001 TIPOA Swat Competition @, in Austin, Texas, September 22-28, 2001;
 - h) Assistant County Auditor to attend the AGrant Training Workshop@, in New Braunfels, Texas, September 18-20, 2001;
 - i) Program Development and Management Director to meet with the officials from the Historical Commission regarding the Dancy Building, in Austin, Texas, September 12 or 13, 2001;

- j) Justice of the Peace Precinct No. 5-2 to attend the ALegislative Session Update Seminar®, in Corpus Christi, Texas, July 29, 2001;
 - k) County Court at Law No. 1 Court Administrator and Court Coordinator to attend the ATexas Association for Court Administration Annual Education Conference®, in San Antonio, Texas, October 23-26, 2001; and
 - l) Constable Precinct No. 1 to attend the AThree Day Training Course on Sex Crimes, Homicide and Violence®, in Mckinney, Texas, October 14-17, 2001.
- 

- (19) APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE CAMERON COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES DISTRICT NO. 1, TO PROVIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.
The Amendment follows:**

- (20) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE CAMERON COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICES DISTRICT NO. 1, TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY SERVICES CONSULTING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.**
The Amendment follows:

- (21) **AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT FOR RESIDENTIAL CHILD CARE SERVICE FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT.**
The Contract follows:

- (22) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR FAMILY HEALTH, TO PROVIDE TITLE V MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES IN CAMERON COUNTY.**
The Contract follows:

- (23) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR FAMILY HEALTH TO PERFORM PUBLIC HEALTH PREVENTIVE SERVICES RELATED TO WOMEN, CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES.**
The Contract follows:

- (24) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES WITH MR. ARMANDO R. VILLALOBOS, TO PROVIDE LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO THE INDIGENT DEFENDANTS OF THE 404TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT.**
The Contract follows:

EXECUTIVE SESSION

(36) **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

Upon motion by Commissioner Valencia, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the Court met in Executive Session at 7:44 P.M. to discuss the following matters:

- a) Deliberation regarding real property concerning the possible development of Tract No. 3 at Sea Ranch Marina and to negotiate a long term concession-lease Agreement; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.
- b) Deliberation regarding real property concerning the possible acquisition of property located at Cameron Park; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.
- c) Deliberation regarding real property concerning the Cameron County District Clerk warehouse with the Brownsville Investment, LP; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Court reconvened in Regular Session at 8:08 P.M.

(36) **ACTION RELATIVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

- a) Deliberation regarding real property concerning the possible development of Tract No. 3 at Sea Ranch Marina and to negotiate a long term concession-lease Agreement.

Commissioner Cascos moved that Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/ Airport Manager, be authorized to negotiate a long term concession-lease agreement with Isla Blanca Inn and Suites, concerning the development of Tract No. 3 at Sea Ranch Marina.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously.

- b) **Deliberation regarding real property concerning the possible acquisition of property located at Cameron Park.**

Commissioner Valencia moved that Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/ Airport Manager, be authorized to negotiate with the property owner the price of the property located at Cameron Park, for the Boys Club.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously.

- ████████████████████
- c) **Deliberation regarding real property concerning the Cameron County District Clerk's warehouse with the Brownsville Investment, LP; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.**

Commissioner Garza moved that Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/ Airport Manager, be authorized to negotiate with Management E, doing business as, Brownsville Business Park, a twelve (12) month Lease Contract regarding the Cameron County District Clerk's Warehouse property.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

████████████████████

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM

- (2) **APPROVAL OF FINANCING AGREEMENT WITH
HEWLETT-PACKARD TO PURCHASE
COMPUTER HARDWARE**

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously, the Financing Agreement with Hewlett-Packard to purchase computer hardware was approved.

The Agreement follows:

There being no further business to come before the Court, upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously, the meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 8:10 P. M.

APPROVED this **9th** day of **October, 2001**.

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

ATTEST:

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