

**THE STATE OF TEXAS**

**COUNTY OF CAMERON**

**BE IT REMEMBERED** on the 11<sup>th</sup> 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 5:33 P.M. He then asked for a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the terrorist acts in New York and Washington, D.C., and the Court lead 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 September 7, 2001, at 2:01 P. M. and the Supplemental Agenda posted September 7, 2001, at 2:12 P. M.:

# **PRESENTATION**

- (1) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING THE PRESENTATION BY MR. FREDDY ELIZONDO, TRINITY FUNERAL CHAPELS REGARDING THE INDIGENT BURIAL SERVICES IN CAMERON COUNTY (TABLED)**

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

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

Commissioner Cascos moved that the 2001 Fiscal Year Budget Amendments No. 2001-38, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously.

**The Budget Amendments are as follows:**

(3) **CONSIDERATION AND ACTION SETTING  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2001, FOR THE ADOPTION OF  
THE TAX RATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002  
BUDGET**

Commissioner Cascos moved that September 18, 2001, be set for the adoption of the tax rate for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

**NOTE: COMMISSIONER GARZA JOINED THE MEETING AT THIS TIME.**

(4) **DISCUSSION REGARDING THE FISCAL YEAR  
2001-2002 BUDGET**

Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, reported that the budget information remained the same as previously presented, with the exception of expenditures in the Jury costs; mailing of the new voting registration cards; and the estimated cost of the living wage of \$7.50 to the General Fund, increasing it by \$28,500.

Commissioner Cascos stated that in reference to the lower end wage workers, he suggested that the Budget Officer estimate the cost to the General Fund of an across the board \$2,100.00 increase for employees earning \$22,000.00 and under; and \$1,500.00 increase for employees earning between \$22,001.00 - \$50,000.00, and \$1,200.00 to the persons earning above \$50,000.00.

Judge Hinojosa cautioned that the Salary Matrix would give recommendations on certain salary amounts and explained that if increases were given prior to the recommendations, it would be difficult to correct.

There was some discussion on several examples of increases, other than the four percent (4%), and the impact on the budget, the impact on the individuals earning the least amount, and the suggestion was made that the calculations not exceed the budgeted amount that equaled the four percent (4%) increase.

Commissioner Valencia questioned whether the increase would apply to the General Fund employee or would it include the Road and Bridge employees, and the suggestion was that all employees be treated equal, but that the employees at the lower pay scale obtain a significant percentage increase versus the higher pay scale employees.

Commissioner Cascos questioned the purpose of the scheduled Workshop for Friday, September 14, 2001, and requested a summary of all requested increases and new positions.

Mr. Villarreal responded that the totals would be presented on Friday at the Workshop, noting that he had not received direction from the Court regarding the requests from the Constables and the Health Department.

Judge Hinojosa noted that the Juvenile Detention Department's request to receive a lump sum amount, rather than a four percent (4%) increase or the \$900.00 across the board increase, would result in significantly less amount, and



( 5 ) **ACTION REGARDING MODIFICATIONS, ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS AT THE CAMERON COUNTY DETENTION FACILITY AND SHERIFF-S DEPARTMENT AND ISSUES RELATED THERETO**

Mr. Randy Haas, Landmark Organization, presented a color board as to the finishing products available to cover the wood at the new Jail Facility, noting that the Sheriff had not approved the selections.

Mr. Joe Santo Petro, Architect, stated that the materials were within the specifications that had been approved by Commissioners- Court over a year ago, and that for informational purposes they were being presented to the Court, adding that the colors were in accordance with the Sheriff-s Department and clarified that the matter was more as to the material to be used for housekeeping purposes.

Mr. Juan Bernal, County Engineer/Public Works Director, stated that an issue of concern was the tile to be placed in the new Jail Facility-s kitchen.

Mr. Mike Lennard, Sheriff-s Department, explained that the tile was already laid on the kitchen floor, but was not the tile on the original specifications, noting that he had no problem with the tile, as long it was equal to or better.

Mr. Santo Petro stated that the specifications were written based on the manufacturers' quality standards and that the product submitted was equal to and had been reviewed and approved, according to the specifications.

Mr. Bernal recommended postponing the matter until he had discussed it with Sheriff Conrado Cantu.

Judge Hinojosa recommended that the matter be approved, subject to the County Engineer and the Sheriff reviewing the issues, and that if problems occurred, that the matter be placed on the Agenda.

Commissioner Valencia moved that the modifications on the kitchen tile at the Cameron County Detention Facility and Sheriff-s Department and issues related thereto, be approved, subject to the approval of the Engineering Office and the Cameron County Sheriff.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously.

Mr. Haas stated there was an issue as to the placement of the shower drains and indicated that the specifications called for a depressed slab, but that he had not placed a depressed slab because he believed it would cause problems draining.

Mr. Santo Petro stated that the blind drainage system was used to drain a roof and that a standard shower would consist of a standard drain, adding that initially it would be acceptable and that it would be the County-s decision.

Mr. Lennard requested that documentation be provided from the Architect, because it was a deviation from the original plans, should a defect exist later on.

At this time, Mr. Lennard noted that the Contract specification identified four (4) washers and four (4) dryers, two (2) large washers and dryers, and two (2) small washers and dryers, and explained that Landmark Organization had purchased a large washer and dryer (175 pounds) and a small washer and dryer (65 pounds) and that the issue was that of defining what the Contract and the Plans stated. He noted that operationally, it met the laundering needs of the Sheriff's Department, but that the plans and specification differed from the original proposal.

Mr. Bernal stated that there were different interpretations because the specifications and the plans differed, and had requested direction from the Legal Department on how to proceed.

Judge Hinojosa noted that according to Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel, the Contract stated that the specification took precedence over the Contract language.

Ms. Dylbia Jefferies Vega, Commissioners= Court Legal Counsel, clarified that the plans took precedence over the Contract language because the plans were constantly changing and being presented to the Court for approval. She stated that the lists of equipment were attached to the Contract, and that they were never changed.

Commissioner Garza asked the cost for the additional equipment and Mr. Haas responded that it was approximately \$40,000.00, including installation.

Ms. Vega stated that should the County reach full capacity and bid out the project, Landmark agreed to credit the County for the washers and dryers, should they be awarded the bid.

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, stated that the County would not be placing the sprinklers in the cells and added that there should be a savings, although the price would not change and that the savings could be applied.

Mr. Haas stated that the additional savings would not include the sprinklers because they had not been included from the beginning, adding that Landmark was going to place them at no additional cost to the County.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the washers, dryers, and sprinklers were not needed and that other items would be needed before the project was completed. He clarified that he was not against obtaining credit for the items, and that the issue regarding the laundry equipment was whether legally they were required to comply and that it appeared to him that they did not have to do so, adding that they were willing to compromise by covering the cost of the installation of the washers and dryers to be relocated.

Mr. Lennard responded that he had addressed the matter at the owners meeting on numerous occasions and stated that they had negotiated with Landmark for months, adding that Mr. Haas had purchased the large washer and dryer and added that now they were before Commissioners= Court for direction.

Commissioner Cascos questioned why the plans and specifications were not reconciled during their reviews, in order to avoid misunderstandings.

Mr. Bernal stated that they had tried to keep up but that due to the numerous changes made to the plans, it had been difficult to do so.

Judge Hinojosa explained that there were numerous cost items that different from the initial Contract, noting that when the County entered into the Contract with Landmark, it was based on a general design, with incomplete Architectural and Engineering plans, and that after working on the plans and specifications for six (6) months, the details were finalized for the project. He stated that it was the consensus of the law enforcement personnel that the showerheads were dangerous and needed to be removed, noting that the change had been done in Hidalgo County and that approval was needed to be obtained from the Texas Jail Commission. He stated that he had one request of Landmark which had not been budgeted, that was a wall sign be built from the same material, indicating it was the Sheriff's Department, making it visible from the road.

Commissioner Garza moved that the modifications, additions and/or deletions at the Cameron County Detention Facility and Sheriff's Department and issues related thereto, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valencia.

At this time, Captain Robert Lopez, Sheriff's Department, informed the Court that the Communications Department had been relocated and that the relocation of the Sheriff's Office should be completed by Friday, September 7, 2001, with the Open House planned for late October.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Garza, seconded by Commissioner Valencia and carried unanimously, the modifications, additions and/or deletions at the Cameron County Detention Facility and Sheriff's Department and issues related thereto, were approved.

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

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

(7) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING REVISED SALARY  
SCHEDULES FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY  
SHERIFF-S DEPARTMENT (REJECTED)**

At this time, Mr. Remi Garza, Administrative Assistant, reported that the Sheriff-s Department had requested changes to the salary schedules because of reorganization to their administration.

Judge Hinojosa questioned whether the changes could not be worked into the new budget, noting that it was a month away.

Captain Rumaldo Rodriguez, Sheriff-s Department, stated that the salary changes referred to reorganization in administration.

Commissioner Cascos expressed his concerns regarding the changes to the salary schedule, noting that compensations were being increased to various officials in the equivalent of sixteen percent (16%) to thirty-four percent (34%) and decreasing compensations to identical slots, as well as other changes and questioned why the matter was not incorporated into the new budget and the salary matrix to be adopted within the next six (6) months.

Captain Rodriguez stated that Sheriff-s Department changes consisted of one (1) Administrator to be Sergeant of the Civil Process and promotions from Lieutenants to Captains, and other changes in the administration.

Captain Robert Lopez noted that the salary changes were within the budget, but were for the current year, and did not include the changes for the 2001-2002 Fiscal Year.

Commissioner Garza questioned whether any of the individuals in the reorganization had changed salaries within the 2000-2001 Fiscal Year.

Mr. Yates stated that the Sheriff took Office in January and complete reorganization had taken place and that the Commissioners= Court had approved the reallocation of their current salaries.

Commissioner Garza questioned whether the requested changes would be the second reorganization within the fiscal year, and whether any of the individuals within the second reorganization had been changed before.

Deputy Rodriguez responded that they had not, as of yet.

Judge Hinojosa stated that salary schedules had been approved for those positions different from the existing positions.

Commissioner Valencia noted that he had some reservations as to the requested salary schedules and noted that he would prefer that the changes began with the new Budget.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the revised Salary schedules for the Cameron County Sheriff's Department, be approved.

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

AYE: Commissioner Benavides and Judge Hinojosa;

NAY: Commissioners Cascos, Garza, and Valencia.

(8) **AUTHORIZATION TO UTILIZE THE HOUSTON/  
GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL OF  
GOVERNMENTS INTERLOCAL PURCHASE  
AGREEMENT TO PURCHASE A CAR FOR THE  
COMPUTER CENTER**

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, explained that the matter pertained to the Federal Emergency Management Assistance (FEMA) vehicle to be used in connection to the 911 Contract.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the utilization of the Houston/Galveston Area Council of Governments Interlocal Purchase Agreement to purchase a car for the Computer Center was approved.

(9) **POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING  
ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES FOR DESIGN AND  
DEVELOPMENT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT  
SUBSTATION IN THE CAMERON PARK  
SUBDIVISION**

Mr. Frank Bejarano, Project Development and Management Director, stated that the item had been presented to the Court for direction and informed them that after the Request for Proposal, none had been submitted. He noted that after receiving no proposals, Judge Hinojosa had suggested to contact an Architect under Contract; therefore, he had contacted Gomez Garza Designs and that they had recommended that the total budgeted amount be increased to \$100,000.00; although, the total cost would not be known.

Commissioner Cascos expressed his concerns with the suggestion and added that if the budgeted amount was increased, other Architects should be given the same opportunity and not limit the project to one (1) architect.

Mr. Bejarano stated that Request for Proposal (RFP) could be solicited but it would cause additional delays.

Commissioner Cascos stated that he would prefer to solicit bids.

Commissioner Garza questioned Legal Counsel as to the matter, and Ms. Dylbia Jefferies L. Vega, Commissioners- Court Legal Counsel, confirmed that the Court was not required to solicit for Request for Proposals (RFP).

Mr. Bejarano stated if the Court chose Request for Proposals (RFP) for professional services, there was a policy

that was followed and requested direction.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the Firm of Gomez, Mendez, Saenz, Inc., be approved to do the Architectural services for the design and development of a Law Enforcement Substation in the Cameron Park Subdivision.

Commissioner Garza asked whether the budget increase was included in the motion.

Judge Hinojosa responded that it was not part of the agenda, and recommended that the amount be increased by \$28,000.00, for the total budget amount of \$100,000.00.

Mr. Bejarano stated that the project design did not require a budget increase, rather the construction of the facility.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the Firm of Gomez, Mendez, Saenz, Inc., be retained to provide the architectural services for design and development of a Law Enforcement Substation in the Cameron Park Subdivision, in the approximate cost of \$100,000.00.

Commissioner Garza stated that the Contract would need to be brought back to the Court.

Mr. Bejarano responded that there was no contract and clarified that he needed approval to proceed in that direction or to do the Request for Proposals (RFP). He stated that a Request for Proposals (RFP) had been requested and added that personally he believed that a Request for Qualification (RFQ) should have been done. He explained that the Substation would be similar to the one the City had built to provide community services. He noted that as originally proposed, the building would be located on a 65'x20' lot with two (2) offices, one (1) conference room and two (2) bedrooms, totaling 1,500 square foot building.

Judge Hinojosa moved that the Firm of Gomez, Mendez, Saenz, Inc., be hired to provide the architectural services for design and development of a Law Enforcement Substation in the Cameron Park Subdivision, in the approximate cost of \$100,000.00.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Garza and Judge Hinojosa;

NAY: None;

ABSTAIN: Commissioners Cascos and Valencia.

Mr. Juan Bernal, County Engineer-Public Works Director, noted that some architects did not bid on projects under \$150,000.00.

**(10) AUTHORIZATION TO NOMINATE THE VALLEY PROUD ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL TO APPLY FOR A GENERAL LAND OFFICE, COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) CYCLE NO. 7 GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$49,000.00 TO CONTINUE THE EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN OF ACAPTAIN CLEAN CRAB® CLEAN-UP PROGRAM FOR THE SPRING AND SUMMER OF 2003**

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Valley Proud Environmental Council was nominated to apply for a General Land Office, Coastal Management Program (CMP) Cycle No. 7 Grant, in the amount of \$49,000.00 to continue the educational campaign of ACaptain Clean Crab® Beach Clean-Up Program for the spring and summer of 2003.

**(11) APPROVAL OF TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CONTRACT NO. 721101 BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT**

Commissioner Valencia moved that the Texas Community Development Program Contract No. 721101 between Cameron County and the Texas Department, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

**The Contract is as follows:**



# **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:**

ITEM NO. 13 - Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, requested the Court permit the bids to be opened the following morning.

ITEM NO. 14 - Commissioner Cascos questioned whether the matter regarding the armored cars had been resolved and stated that the new improved process was costing an additional \$3,500.00. Mr. Yates stated that the cost associated with the banks had been anticipated in the selection of the depository, adding that the drop safes had been installed at Goolsby Building in San Benito.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Cascos, Garza, and Valencia,

NAY: None,

ABSTAIN: Judge Hinojosa as to Southwest Key Program La Esperanza, Warrant No. 00061931, in the amount of \$26,722.04 and as to Laguna Madre Water District, Warrant No. 00062107, in the amount of \$151.66.

**(13) APPROVAL OF COUNTY CLAIMS;**

**Affidavits of Conflict follows:**

**Additional late claim:**

**Warrant No. 00062261, as to Tex and Coast Eye Surgery, in the amount \$23,345.28.**

**(14) AUTHORIZATION TO RENEW THE AWARD BID NO. 1180-ARMORED CAR SERVICES FOR ONE (1) ADDITIONAL YEAR;  
ROCHESTER ARMORED CAR, Omaha, Nebraska - \$4.313.62.**

**(15) AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN THE FOLLOWING BIDS:**

- a) **Paint, Varnish, Stain - Annual Bid No. 2008;**
- b) **Paper: Print Shop and Computer - Annual Bid No. 2460;**
- c) **Tire Repairs -Annual Bids No. 1850;**
- d) **Food: Meats - Quarterly Bid No. 2170-4; and**
- e) **Shelving - Sheriff's Department.**

**The Bid Tabulation Follows:**

**(16) PRELIMINARY APPROVAL:**

- a) **Precinct No. 3 - The Heather Subdivision - a 20.000 Acre Tract of land, more or less, being the west one half of Block No. 336, San Benito Irrigation Company;**
- b) **Precinct No. 3 - Cragon Estates - Being the east thirty acres (30) of Block No. 28, Wilson Tract Subdivision;**
- c) **Precinct No. 3 - Palomar Subdivision - Being 10.438 acre tract of land out of the Southwest Part of Block No. 10, Briggs Coleman Subdivision of**

**Survey No. 49;**

- d) **Precinct No. 3 - Montezuma Estates Subdivision - A 15.375 acre tract of land, more or less, same being 0.487 acres out of Block No. 55 and 14.888 acres out of Block No. 54, David and Stevenson Subdivision;**
  - e) **Precinct No. 4 - Ferria-Rosa Subdivision - Being a subdivision of 29.32 acres out of Block No. 72, Minnesota-Texas Land and Irrigation Company; and**
  - f) **Precinct No. 4 - North Parker Road Subdivision - Being a Subdivision of the east 9.05 acres out of Block No. 114, Minnesota-Texas Land and Irrigation Company Subdivision.**
- (17) **PURCHASE WITHOUT A PURCHASE ORDER TO UNITED MEDICAL SUPPLY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$354.90.**

**TRAVEL ITEMS**

- (18) **AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL/OR APPROVAL OF TRAVEL EXPENSE FOR THE FOLLOWING (PLEASE NOTE: TRAVEL REQUESTS ARE SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE COUNTY POLICIES):**
- a) Parks Director to attend the ATexas Parks and Wildlife Officials@in Austin, Texas, September 9, 2001;
  - b) Two (2) Parks employees to attend the ANational Playground Safety Inspection Certification Course@, in Georgetown, Texas, October 29, 2001;
  - c) Eight (8) Health Department employees to attend the AField Safety-Diffusing Aggressive Behavior Workshop@, in South Padre Island, Texas, September 26, 2001;
  - d) Four (4) Health Department employees to attend the ANurse TB Case Management Workshop@, in South Padre Island, Texas, September 25-27, 2001;
  - e) Two (2) Sheriff-s Department Deputies to attend ALeading Community Policing Seminar@, in Huntsville, Texas, September 12-14, 2001;
  - f) Program Development and Management Department employee to attend the ATexas Department of Housing and Community Affairs Review of Senate Bill No. 322 and its impact on the Agency-s Program and Services@, in Austin , Texas, September 16-17, 2001;
  - g) County District Attorney to attend the ATexas HIDTA Executive Committee Meeting@, in San Antonio, Texas, September 19-20, 2001;
  - h) Two (2) Juvenile Probation employees to transport cadets to Galveston, Texas, November 20-25, 2001;
  - i) Justices of the Peace Precinct No. 1 and No. 5 to attend the ASouth Texas Justices of the Peace and Constables Conference@, September 20-22, 2001; and
  - j) Eight (8) Unidos Podemos members to attend the AState Comprehensive Strategy Meeting@, September 16-18, 2001.

- (13) **APPROVAL OF COUNTY CLAIMS;**  
**The Affidavits is as follows:**

- (15) **AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN THE FOLLOWING BIDS:**
- a) **Paint, Varnish, Stain - Annual Bid No. 2008;**
  - b) **Paper: Print Shop and Computer - Annual Bid No. 2460;**
  - c) **Tire Repairs -Annual Bids No. 1850;**
  - d) **Food: Meats - Quarterly Bid No. 2170-4; and**
  - e) **Shelving - Sheriff's Department.**

**The Bid Tabulation Follows:**

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### **(30) EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Court met in Executive Session at 7:08 P.M. to discuss the following matters:

- a) Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible development of Tract No. 3 at the Sea Ranch Marina; 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 various properties for the Dancy Building; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072;
- c) 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; and
- d) Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible re-sale of various Cameron County trustee and surplus properties as listed below; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072.
  - a) 02-5610-0220-0142-00-Wilson Street  
East Brownsville Addition regarding 2, Lot No. 14, Block 22;
  - b) 76-8710-0720-0010-00- Abstract No. 2 - Monte Grande I  
Block No. 72, 5.000 acres;
  - c) 01-9330-0180-0038-00 - Brownsville - Land and Improvement  
Company,  
140 x 79.4 of 1/3 Lot No. 3, Block No. 4;
  - d) 04-2120-0070-0130-00-Delia Lane  
Brownsville - La Lomita Section II, Lot No. 13, Block No. 17;
  - e) 49-0000-0060-0210-00 - 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Carmen Avenue  
Primera - Original Townsite Lot No. 21, Block No. 6;
  - f) 97-8930-0030-0030-00- Survey - Las Palmas No. 3, Lot No. 3, Block No.  
3;
  - g) 45-0100-0010-0390-00 - Olmito - Groves A-L, Block No. 153;
  - h) 98-0030-0710-0100-00 - Survey - Macleod-Hood  
Block No. 71, Southeast 5 acres;
  - i) 45-3200-1890-0160-00 - Olmito- Graybil Lot No. 16, Block No. 189; and
  - j) 45-3200-0170-00 - Olmito - Graybil Lot No. 17, Block No. 198.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Court reconvened in Regular Session at 7:25 P.M.

**NOTE: Commissioner Valencia left the meeting at this time.**

(20) **ACTION RELATIVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- a) **Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible development of Tract No. 3 at the Sea Ranch Marina.**

Commissioner Garza moved that Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/Airport Manager, be authorized to begin negotiations for the preparation of the Contract with Vick Kazan and Company to enter into a concession on Tract No. 3 at the Sea Ranch Marina.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

- [REDACTED]**  
b) **Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible acquisition of various properties for the Dancy Building.**

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Status Report presented by Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/Airport Manager, regarding acquisition of various properties for the Dancy Building was acknowledged.

- [REDACTED]**  
c) **Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible acquisition of property located at Cameron Park.**

Commissioner Garza moved that Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/Airport Manager, be authorized to make one final offer for the acquisition of the property located in Cameron Park, and if not, to proceed with condemnation proceedings.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

- [REDACTED]**  
d) **Deliberation regarding Real Property concerning the possible re-sale of various Cameron County trustee and surplus properties as listed below:**  
a) **02-5610-0220-0142-00-Wilson Street  
East Brownsville addition regarding 2, Lot No. 14, Block 22;**  
b) **76-8710-0720-0010-00 - Abstract No. 2 - Monte Grande I,  
Block No. 72, 5.000 acres;**  
c) **01-9330-0180-0038-00 - Brownsville - Land and Improvement Company,  
140 x 79.4 of 1/3 Lot No. 3, Block No. 4;**  
d) **04-2120-0070-0130-00-Delia Lane  
Brownsville - La Lomita Section II, Lot No. 13, Block No. 17;**

Upon motion by Commissioner Garza, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, Mr. Joseph Ardito, Property/Airport Manager, was authorized to begin the process of selling the properties as described below:

- a) 02-5610-0220-0142-00-Wilson Street  
East Brownsville addition regarding 2, Lot No. 14, Block 22;  
b) 76-8710-0720-0010-00 - Abstract No. 2 - Monte Grande I,  
Block No. 72, 5.000 acres;  
c) 01-9330-0180-0038-00 - Brownsville - Land and Improvement Company,

- d) 140 x 79.4 of 1/3 Lot No. 3, Block No. 4;  
04-2120-0070-0130-00-Delia Lane  
Brownsville - La Lomita Section II, Lot No. 13, Block No. 17;
- e) 49-0000-0060-0210-00 - 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Carmen Avenue  
Primera - Original Townsite Lot No. 21, Block No. 6;
- f) 97-8930-0030-0030-00 - Survey - Las Palmas -No. 3, Lot No. 3, Block No. 3;
- g) 45-0100-0010-0390-00 - Olmito - Groves A-L, Block No. 153;
- h) 98-0030-0710-0100-00 - Survey - Macleod-Hood,  
Block No. 71, Southeast 5 acres;
- i) 45-3200-1890-0160-00 - Olmito- Graybill Lot No. 16, Block No. 189; and
- j) 45-3200-0170-00 - Olmito - Graybill Lot No. 17, Block No. 198.

██

There being no further business to come before the Court, upon motion by Commissioner Garza, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 7:37 P. M.

██

**APPROVED** this **30th** 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.**