

THE STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF CAMERON §

BE IT REMEMBERED on the 9th day of SEPTEMBER 2003, there was conducted a Regular Public Meeting of the Honorable Commissioners' Court of Cameron County, Texas, at the Courthouse thereof, in the City of Brownsville, Texas, for the purpose of transacting any and all business that may lawfully be brought before the same.

THE COURT MET AT:

9:30 A.M.

PRESENT:

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

PEDRO "PETE" BENAVIDES
COMMISSIONER PRECINCT NO. 1

JOHN WOOD
COMMISSIONER PRECINCT NO. 2

DAVID A. GARZA
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 3

EDNA TAMAYO
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 4

JOE G. RIVERA
COUNTY CLERK

Mary Robles Deputy Clerk

ABSENT:

The meeting was called to order by Judge Hinojosa at 9:54 A.M. He then asked Reverend Bob Clark, Brownsville resident, for the invocation, praying for Mr. Eddie Treviño Senior who was ill. Judge Hinojosa informed of the death of Mr. Roger Olson, Former Law Enforcement Safety Coordinator, and led 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 September 5, 2003, at 2:44 P.M.:

PRESENTATION

(12) **CONSIDERATION AND AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOCATE OFFICE SPACE AT THE CAMERON COUNTY ANNEX IN HARLINGEN TO STATE REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT 35**

Judge Hinojosa stated that Mr. Juan M. Escobar, State Representative District 35 requested that the County provide him with Office Space, and suggested that the Office Space vacated by Commissioner Precinct No. 4 be provided.

Ms. Clarissa Garza, Office of State Representative District No. 35, thanked the Court for providing Office Space, and informed that she would staff the Office 20 hours a week.

Commissioner Tamayo recommended that the large front Office be allocated to the State Representative and that the two (2) small Offices be allocated to the County Clerk.

Mr. Remi Garza, County Administrative Assistant, stated that the facility could be easily divided to house the State Representative and County Clerk.

Commissioner Garza informed that the County Clerk offered to have his staff answer phone calls for the State Representative's Office.

At this time, there was a brief discussion regarding the need for storage space and the clarification was made that a meeting was scheduled with the Property Manager to discuss storage space at the County Warehouse.

Upon motion by Commissioner Tamayo, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the allocation of Office Space at the Cameron County Annex in Harlingen to State Representative District No. 35, was authorized.

(1) **PRESENTATION BY MR. FRUCTOSO GOMEZ, CHIEF APPRAISER, CAMERON COUNTY APPRAISAL DISTRICT, ON PROPERTY VALUES IN CAMERON COUNTY**

Commissioner Garza explained that that the Cameron County Chief Appraiser was in attendance to make a brief Presentation regarding appraised values to address discrepancies brought before the Court at his request.

Mr. Fructoso Gomez, Chief Appraiser, stated that in January the Appraisal District start appraisals for the County and 46 other entities and reviews market conditions of all properties to determine if they must be reappraised. He informed that the Appraisal District was currently reviewing building permits in order to place items considered taxable by law on the tax roles. Mr. Gomez explained that property values were reviewed between January and April and that approximately 180,000 notices were mailed out in April, adding that approximately 6,800

values were protested. He explained that the Appraisal District reviews and provides Homestead and over 65 years of age exemptions and Ag Exemptions for farmed properties, as per State law. Mr. Gomez stated that taxes for properties applying for Ag Exemptions were paid based on the agriculture value and added that a mechanism provided by State determines if use of property for agriculture purposes was ceased after five (5) years then there would be a rollback in taxes.

Commissioner Garza questioned if this was the case with the individual that approached the Court.

Mr. Gomez responded in the affirmative.

Judge Hinojosa explained that an individual complained that property being considered for purchase by the City of Brownsville for construction of a sports complex had been appraised below the selling price, adding that the property was considered agriculture property. He asked what would happen if the property was converted from agriculture property to non agriculture property.

Mr. Gomez responded that there would be a rollback in taxes for five (5) years at market value plus the 7% interest. He stated that the individual was invited to attend the Appraisal District in order to explain how the system works and how the office operates, yet he did not attend.

Mr. Gomez explained that the land must be used for agriculture purposes and that the exemption would not be lost if the land was left idle for one (1) or two (2) years at State's request.

Judge Hinojosa asked if there must be a certain number of livestock per acre.

Mr. Gomez responded that he has not seen such provision in the Tax Code; however, he would review the matter. He informed that 10,360 letters would be mailed to business owners, based on Senate Bill 340, to determine who has failed to submit their business personal property renditions.

Commissioner Benavides questioned the status of the 6,800 cases protested.

Mr. Gomez stated that 1,000 acres went before the Appraisal Review Board, 2,900 did not appear before the Appraisal Review Board, 400 canceled, and that 2,500 settled the value with staff. He clarified that the Appraisal District gets audited by the State Comptroller.

Mr. Buster Varner, Appraisal District, presented an annual Report prepared by the Property Tax Division of the State Comptroller's Office concerning the Appraisal District, and stated that the Appraisal District was currently at 98% at market value as determined by the State Comptroller's Office.

Commissioner Garza moved that the Presentation by Mr. Fructoso Gomez, Chief Appraiser, Cameron County Appraisal District, on property values in Cameron County be acknowledged.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wood and carried unanimously.

The Report is as follows:

ACTION ITEMS

(2) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND/OR SALARY SCHEDULES (TABLED)**

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

(3) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
A. AUGUST 5, 2003-REGULAR MEETING**

Commissioner Garza moved that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held August 5, 2003, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo and carried unanimously.

(4) **CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUNDING SOURCE FOR THE RIO GRANDE VALLEY HEALTH SERVICES DISTRICT FROM CAMERON COUNTY**

Judge Hinojosa informed that by law the County must forward all Tobacco Funds to the Health Service District upon contracting with the County, and noted that the contract remains pending. He stated that Judge Ramon Garcia, Hidalgo County Judge, and he proposed that the Health Service District present a Budget and that the Counties fund them on a pro rated basis, based upon the Tobacco Fund's allocation. Judge Hinojosa explained that the County would not expend all Tobacco Funds on the Health Services District, but rather would fund its annual budget, and that although the Health Service District dislikes the proposal they were in a position to agree. He informed that a draft budget, in the amount of \$190,000.00, and a draft contract were prepared and would be reviewed by the Health Services District tomorrow and presented to the Court for consideration in the near future. Judge Hinojosa clarified that Tobacco Funds were not allocated and varied between \$75,000.00 and \$50,000.00 per year.

Commissioner Garza commented that an individual, with whom negotiations were taking place, indicated that the Health Service District was requesting Tobacco Funds received throughout the past five (5) years.

Judge Hinojosa stated that once the Health Service District was fully operational. the total Tobacco Funds allocation would be provided.

Commissioner Garza noted the need to have guidelines and timelines in place.

Judge Hinojosa clarified that guidelines and timelines were set by Statutes. He informed that Texas A&M

University would prepare a Comprehensive Strategic Plan that sets out how the Health Service District will operate at no cost to the County. He commented that the process of transferring over \$8 million in Indigent Funds and Tobacco Funds to the Health Service District was not easy.

Upon motion by Commissioner Tamayo, seconded by Commissioner Wood and carried unanimously, the discussion concerning a possible funding source for the Rio Grande Valley Health Services District from Cameron County was acknowledged.

Judge Hinojosa recommended that an Item be placed on the Agenda once a month for informational purposes, and that a Workshop be held jointly between Cameron and Hidalgo Counties.

-
- (5) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING CONSIDERATION AND ACTION TO ESTABLISH THE PRECINCT LINES OF JUSTICE OF THE PEACES AND CONSTABLES IN CAMERON COUNTY (NO ACTION TAKEN)**

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM

- (1) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON POSSIBLE REALIGNMENT OF THE JUSTICE OF THE PEACE/CONSTABLES PRECINCTS OF CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS (NO ACTION TAKEN)**

-
- (6) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE ELIMINATION OF EXISTING JUSTICE OF THE PEACE PRECINCT 7, PLACE 1 IN CAMERON COUNTY (DENIED)**

- (7) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING CONSIDERATION AND ACTION FOR APPROVAL ON MODIFYING THE FOLLOWING PRECINCTS BY COMBINING: PARTS OF PRECINCT 54 AND PART OF PRECINCT 48 TO PRECINCT 4; PART OF PRECINCT 28 AND PART OF PRECINCT 64 TO PRECINCT 87; COMBINING PRECINCT 2A TO PRECINCT 66 AND PRECINCT 62A TO PRECINCT 9; DESIGNATING PRECINCT 28'S VOTING LOCATION TO PRIMERA (WILSON ELEMENTARY) AND DESIGNATING PRECINCT 64 TO THE PALM VALLEY VOTING LOCATION; MODIFYING THE SOUTHERN PRECINCT LINE OF PRECINCT 22 TO ROAD 800 AND CREATING A NEW PRECINCT (88) AND ALLOWING ITS VOTERS TO CONTINUE VOTING AT THE PRECINCT 22 VOTING LOCATION (TABLED)**

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM

(2) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS AND ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE ELIMINATION OF EXISTING JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT NO. 7, PLACE NO. 1, CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS (DENIED)**

Commissioner Benavides moved that these Items be **TABLED**.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo.

Judge Hinojosa explained that the intention was to address issues deriving from conflict with redistricting of Commissioner Precincts and Legislative lines; however, State Law allows that this process take place only in April and May of odd numbered years. He stated that elimination of Justice of the Peace, Precinct No. 7, Place No. 1, was not a good idea because at least one Justice of the Peace was needed in the rural areas, and requested that one Justice of the Peace relocate to the River area.

Justice of the Peace Dan Sanchez, Precinct No. 7, Place No. 2, explained that he moved to La Feria because at the time he took Office his Budget did not allow for staff and that Judge Salas was gracious enough to share his staff and Office Space in Los Indios.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that Office Space be sought at the Los Indios International Bridge.

Commissioner Garza suggest that the Court vote.

Commissioner Benavides moved that these Items be **TABLED**.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo.

Mr. Oscar Guerra, County resident, requested that the Court vote on this Item.

Commissioner Garza moved that the motion be amended in order for Item No. 6 and Supplemental Item No. 2 to be **DENIED**.

Commissioners Benavides and Tamayo accepted the motion to amend.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides that Item No. 6 and Supplemental Item No. 2 be **DENIED**, and that Item No. 7 be **TABLED**.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo and carried unanimously.

(5) **CONSIDERATION AND ACTION TO ESTABLISH
PRECINCT LINES OF JUSTICE OF THE PEACES AND
CONSTABLES IN CAMERON COUNTY**

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM

(1) **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON POSSIBLE
REALIGNMENT OF THE JUSTICE OF THE
PEACE/CONSTABLES PRECINCTS OF CAMERON
COUNTY, TEXAS**

Judge Hinojosa- "The only difference in this map from what's been shown to you in the past is the items that were contained in No. 7 and the main issues. There are the two major Precincts that were going to be changed, which was the Precinct in Combes and the Precinct in Olmito, right?"

Mr. Silver Garcia, County Judge's Office – "Yeah."

Judge Hinojosa- "Everything else is little slivers here and there that would change. But every Commissioner that's up here has seen this same map except for those two major changes that we weren't able to accomplish because of Item No. 7. But essentially the major differences in this map are as follows."

Commissioner Garza – "Do we have a current map? No? The current lines?"

Mr. Garcia – "The current lines, I don't have a copy."

Judge Hinojosa – "But let me just describe to you what it does, so that you'll know. What are the numbers, Silver? Precinct No. 1, which is the Laguna Madre Precinct, we've added Precinct 10..."

Mr. Garcia – "VTD 14 and VTD 68."

Judge Hinojosa – "Right, which are the two Precincts that are to the east of Brownsville, immediately, Valle Escondido, Valle Hermoso and then Rio Del Sol. We've run these by the Constable and the Justice of the Peace there in Laguna Madre and they're fine with it."

Mr. Garcia – "And the Commissioner of Precinct 1 too."

Judge Hinojosa – "...and the Commissioner of Precinct 1 as well. That's the only change in Precinct No. 1. Precinct No. 2 is Brownsville so the only change that occurred there is that they are losing VTD 14 and VTD 68 they are taken away from what was in Brownsville and so the only change that occurred there is..."

Mr. Garcia – "Is that they are losing VTD 14 and 68."

Judge Hinojosa – "Taken away from what was in Brownsville over to Laguna Madre. Now we had proposed to cut Precinct 54 in half and 48 to make all of Olmito part of Precinct 4."

Mr. Garcia – "VTD 4."

Judge Hinojosa – “VTD 4. No the JP/Constable 4.”

Mr. Garcia – “No it would be JP Precinct 6.”

Judge Hinojosa – “I’m sorry it would be JP/Constable Precinct 6, which is Burnias and Judge Ortiz, but we couldn’t do that because of what I said earlier, because we would be realigning Voter Districts and we can’t do that. We had attempted to do that at the request of Constable Burnias and Judge Ortiz because they felt that Olmito should be all in one Precinct. Right now, what’s the name of that highway?”

Commissioner Wood – “1732”

Judge Hinojosa – “Everybody to the south of 1732 in Olmito votes in Brownsville. Everybody to the north of that votes in the Los Fresnos Precinct, and it creates a lot of confusion because the folks have to travel all the way to the voting place in Precinct 54 which is located at Burns, and that was a real problem.”

Commissioner Benavides – “Let me ask you Judge. Excuse me for interrupting. Does that mean that people from Brownsville have to go all the way to Port Isabel to vote?”

Judge Hinojosa – “No you have a voting Precinct in the same locations that you have always had.”

Commissioner Garza – “To pay a fine yeah.”

Judge Hinojosa – “To pay a fine you might have to.”

Commissioner Garza – “And the Judge has to go all the way over there for an inquest? I mean that is like an hour away, right?”

Judge Hinojosa – “That’s the case in a lot of areas. Not an hour away it’s like a 25 minutes drive. Anyway going back to Brownsville, in Precinct 6 the only change now ...”

Mr. Garcia – “Is that we’re moving VTD 51 out of Precinct 6, which is La Paloma, into Precinct 7.”

Commissioner Tamayo – “Which would be..?”

Mr. Garcia – “La Feria.”

Judge Hinojosa – “So now you’ll have in La Feria, you’ll have la Paloma, Los Indios, and Santa Maria, Bluetown, all those as part of that Precinct.”

Mr. Garcia – “And Rangerville.”

Judge Hinojosa – “And Rangerville, and we’ve added Rangerville Road to that.”

Commissioner Tamayo – “And where do you have Santa Rosa?”

Judge Hinojosa – “Santa Rosa now is added onto a northern JP Precinct, which will be now Santa Rosa the northern part of Combes... part of Primera as well?”

Mr. Garcia – “No. It’s the northern and southern, the eastern part of Combes, Rio Hondo, and Las Yescas. The only change to Precinct 4 is we moved Santa Rosa over to them.”

Commissioner Tamayo- “And the rational behind that was because of the fact that you added to the La Feria...”

Mr. Garcia – “Well it equalizes, it sort of equalizes the population. The Precinct 4 only had about 10,000 in population, which now by adding Santa Rosa, it goes up to about 16,000 in population. And that JP was just made a full time JP and I think that should justify this.”

Judge Hinojosa – “No changes are made to the Harlingen Precinct.”

Mr. Garcia - “No none.”

Commissioner Tamayo – “I think somebody would like to say something Judge.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Hold on just a second. I’m going to give the public a chance in just a second. No changes are made to the Harlingen Precinct and... other than the Rangerville Road Precinct.”

Mr. Garcia – “VTD 22 and 51 being added to Precinct 7.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Right, and San Benito then becomes almost entirely the same, except that we’ve just expanded the other Precinct and made it more of a combination La Feria and a River Precinct.”

Commissioner Garza – “Judge, how about 17?”

Commissioner Tamayo – “17 stays the same.”

Commissioner Garza – “Yeah I know, but you know one of the biggest complaints I’ve had from 17 and 51 both, which 51 is La Paloma, is that they have to drive by the JP’s in San Benito to go see JP Ortiz cause their JP is in Los Fresnos. The majority of that area travels into San Benito as a regular course of either work or shopping, whatever. It’s most contiguous to San Benito and you know it doesn’t make any sense to keep all those people in those two Precincts. Now they’re going to have to go either to Los Indios or La Feria wherever we have that Office. Doesn’t it make more sense to just add 51 and 17 to San Benito as we had discussed? Remember I had visited with you on that one?”

Mr. Garcia – “Well you told me that you would like to see that.”

Commissioner Garza – “Yes because of the fact that people complain that you have to drive to Los Fresnos to deal with a JP. And I have talked to both JPs there and they both said that they regularly get people from those two Precincts visiting them for services and they have to be referred to Los Fresnos.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Well one of the JP. I know that there was no support amongst the JP’s to move Precinct 17 over to San Benito.”

Mr. Garcia – “One JP and then the Constable had said in support, and together with the JP, the Constable was totally against having that it changed.”

Judge Hinojosa – “So one JP is very adamant against it. The Constable doesn’t like the idea either...”

Mr. Garcia – “One JP would like it, but the other one doesn’t.”

Commissioner Garza – “I visited with both JP’s and they both suggested that ‘you tell me where you want me to serve and I’ll serve there.’ They did not have a problem with it.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Well I visited with both of the JP’s and one of the JPs was very adamant against it so. And we’ve talked to some of the community there in El Ranchito and they’re very opposed to changing from where they’re at right now.”

Commissioner Garza – “I know that I talked to Francis and she didn’t have a problem.”

Judge Hinojosa – “You want to get her on the phone right now? Get her on the phone; let’s see if that is true Commissioner.”

Commissioner Garza – “As a matter of fact I said ‘will you please give that to me in writing’ and she said let me see if I can get to you.”

Mr. Garcia – “And that I remember, that you said you were going to have that in writing.”

Commissioner Garza – “She hasn’t giving it to me.”

Judge Hinojosa – “That’s not what she told us. She was very much opposed to that.”

Commissioner Tamayo – “The problem that I have was with Santa Rosa being pulled to that other. That’s the most cause that I’ve got.”

Mr. Garcia – “You’re equalizing the population to be able to justify the JP’s position. I mean, that JP position went from a part time position to a full time position; there’s a \$25,000.00 increase that doesn’t justify a part time JP. We’ve spoken to the Justice of the Peace in the area and he’s fine with the move, as long as he doesn’t

loose VTD 2.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Which is Las Yescas...”

Mr. Garcia – “Las Yescas.”

Judge Hinojosa – “...and Arroyo City. Okay, well that’s essentially the Plan. Do other people want to speak for or against?”

Mr. Oscar Guerra, Santa Rosa resident – “We didn’t ask to be redrawn or whatever you call this to justify the redrawing is to promote a Judge from part time to full time and then turn around and say well that justifies the \$40,000.00 he gets paid. Santa Rosa doesn’t want that. We belong in La Feria. We want to stay there. That’s what the community is saying, and that’s what I’m bringing to you people. Thank you.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Any other comments?”

Commissioner Tamayo – “I wanted to ask Legal Counsel, as we are doing this, I’m the new kid on the block so; I just want clarification so we didn’t have to bring this before a public hearing or this process?”

Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners’ Court Legal Counsel – “Actually the process that we’re going to recommend you follow. This is kind of an initial Order. You’re in effect proposing this and adopting it as your Order. There’s no procedural process outlined under Article 5 section 18 of Constitution and that’s where you get the power to divide up the County into Precincts for the Justice of the Peace and Constables; however, there’s case law that says that you have to provide procedural due process. In other words when you affect the JPs and the Constables you have to give them an opportunity to present their views to you because in the redistricting process you may eliminate a position. That’s possible for you to do, although that’s not what you contemplate here. So what you’re doing today is putting out before the public an Order that would make the combinations as you agree to here today. It would be our recommendation, although there isn’t a set procedure established by the Constitutional Provision, you ought to probably publish it at least once. What the Statute contemplates is at least three (3) times. And then have a public hearing in the future. And then finally in affect receive all the information to be adopted or except that as the final version and then send it to the Justice Department for approval.”

Commissioner Tamayo – “Is that what’s going to happen?”

Judge Hinojosa – “Well that’s what our recommendations are. Yes sir.”

Mr. Eliseo Contrera, County resident – “Will it be considered, you know, changing all these like redistricting or not? In a way?”

Judge Hinojosa – “It would be redistricting JP and Constable Slots.”

Mr. Contreras – “But would it be considered redistricting? You know, like the general rule by the State is like every 10 years, like when the census takes place, and you know that problem that we’re having with the State.”

Judge Hinojosa – “The last time we redistricted the JP and Constable slots was in 1995. So we do them at different stages. We didn’t do any redistricting after the census issue, because you don’t have to... Unlike the census, the reason why you redistrict after census for Legislative slots and Commissioner slots is that you have to get them within certain percentage of size from one to another: State Representative, Congressional and Commissioner Precincts have to be about the same population size within a percentage. JP/Constables slots can be any size. A good example is La Feria with what action we’ve taken today you’re going to have two JPs in a Precinct that’s got 19,000 people in it, where you have one, two, three other Precincts about the same size with only one JP in it. It’s not the same. La Feria has two JPs, and it’s got 19,000 people. Brownsville has two JPs, and it has 150,000 people in it. It does have anything to do with size. But you do redistricting to get things kind of more evenly distributed as much as possible.”

Mr. Contrera – “Equalization of population within the District, right.”

Judge Hinojosa – “...and work loads as well.”

Mr. Contrera – “Well I think this should have been done earlier, you know. When the Justice was vacant, you know. I don’t think we should have waited this many years to equalize the population in this District.”

Judge Hinojosa – “It’s actually... Okay, thank you, any other comments?”

Commissioner Garza – “Well that being the case; you know there’s only 19,000 people in that new Precinct. Maybe we should consider leaving Santa Rosa in the green area there.”

Commissioner Wood – “Then you end up with how many in the ...”

Mr. Garcia – “25,000 and 10,000 in the ...”

Commissioner Garza – “Yeah but you just have one JP over there and two over here.”

Mr. Garcia – “Port Isabel has 29,000 and has one JP.”

Commissioner Wood – “Now Brownsville has 150,000 and two JPs. That’s 75,000 per JP on the average.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Okay any other discussion? Okay. I would like ... The proposed Order that I would like to recommend is an Order that I would recommend that we adopt and publish... how many times?”

Mr. Wright – “Well I think that’s to the discretion of the Court. What the Statute contemplates is three consecutive weeks and then the following week, have the public hearing. But I don’t think that really is dictated to you. It would certainly be persistent with Election Code, but under the Constitutional Provision there is no procedure specifically set out. So what you’d be doing is adopting the same process that is required when you change Voter Precincts.”

Judge Hinojosa – “So can we publish it this week, next week, and then the Monday proceeding the last meeting of October, and then consider it on the last meeting of October.”

Mr. Wright – “I’m sure that a Court would find that more than adequate from a procedural due process.”

Judge Hinojosa – “So that’s three.”

Mr. Remi Garza, County Administrative Assistant – “You mean October or September.”

Judge Hinojosa – “The last week of September, I’m sorry. So we should publish it this week, which is the week of the 8th, next week, the week of the 15th and then on Monday, the week of the 22nd and then consider it for final approval on the meeting of the 23rd. Okay, with the Meeting on the 23rd?”

Mr. Wright – “29th.”

Mr. Garza – “30th.”

Judge Hinojosa – “We would consider it for final approval on the meeting of the 30th. If that is what we decide to do.”

Mr. Wright – “You’ll have the Public Hearing one day after... We can publish next Sunday and then each Sunday for two, three consecutive times, and then the public hearing at the next following Tuesday after that the 30th.”

Commissioner Wood – “That’s the 30th.”

Judge Hinojosa – “And this proposed Order matches what is in this map.”

Mrs. Dylbia Jefferies Vega, Contract Attorney – “Yes sir.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Alright. Let me just read that.”

At this time Judge Hinojosa read the following *proposed* Order:

Mrs. Jeffries – “We need to make one correction.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Okay, what is that?”

Mrs. Jeffries – “On Voter Tabulation District 25 we were led to believe that part was split for some reason part of it went into Precinct 3 and part of it went into Precinct 7. Roger just let us know that all of it is already in Precinct No. 7, so we don’t need to do anything with that.”

Judge Hinojosa – “So number four is out? All of number four is out?”

Mrs. Jeffries – “Yes. Is that the one that talks about voter Precincts?”

Judge Hinojosa – “It says ‘Voter Tabulation District No. 551 from Justice of the Peace/Constable Precinct No. 6 to Justice of the Peace/Constable No. 7.’”

Mrs. Jeffries – “It’s already all in No.7.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Okay, so that’s out.”

Mrs. Jeffries – “So I will re-do it.”

Judge Hinojosa – “And so the motion is one, two, three, and five, and that it be publish for three consecutive Sundays and considered for final adoption September 30, 2004. Do I hear a motion?”

Commissioner Wood – “I so move.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Is there a second to that motion? Is there a second to that motion?”

Commissioner Benavides – “I’ll second it.”

Judge Hinojosa – “There’s a motion and a second, any further discussion?”

Commissioner Tamayo – “Judge I am going to have to vote against it for the simple reason that I don’t approve of Santa Rosa being pulled into the other Precinct.”

Judge Hinojosa – “Any further discussion? All those in favor signify by stating Aye.”

Commissioner Benavides, Commissioner Wood, and Judge Hinojosa – “Aye”

Judge Hinojosa – “All those oppose?”

Commissioner Garza and Commissioner Tamayo – “Nay”

Judge Hinojosa – “Motion carries. Alright so we’ll reconsider this Item for final adoption September 30th 2004. Okay.”

Mr. Garza – “Just for clarification; that’s September of 2003.”

Judge Hinojosa – “I meant 2003, I’m sorry.”

Commissioner Wood – “It becomes effective January 1, 2004.”

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA STEPPED OUT OF THE COURTROOM.

Commissioner Garza – “I think we should have been given that information before we vote on it, you know.”

Commissioner Wood – “Which part?”

Commissioner Garza – “Like the Order, it’s not here yet. I mean that Order came to me like...it’s not here yet. Let the record reflect that we had no information to base ourselves with, as far as the Order that we’ve approve from Precinct 3 Commissioner. You know I had... what was read was all I heard and I had zero information before this meeting. I’d appreciate it in the future that if you’re gonna prepare a legal document that we get a chance to at least look at it before we vote on it and approve an Order by this Court. I think it’s being derelict in our duties to do that. Because there are even changes to the Order we were given before we approved it that your own Office had because they had wrong information. And I think that if we can’t have an Order before us that is correct and ready to be approved that we need to be more careful on how we operate this Court. And I know you operate under pressure, but all you have to say is ‘I’m not ready for this to happen’, you know. I think that... You know Roger is sitting over there, Voter Registrar, whatever it is that he does. He is totally put on the spot because of the information that he is hearing from what is being read up here and there’s only one copy. So I would appreciate, in a more timely manner to be informed of things of this nature.”

Mr. Wright – “Commissioner I understand your position. The problem is as Counsel all I can do is provide to you what is provided to us. And frankly that information wasn’t until this morning to put together. We just prepared the Order this morning. I don’t know that other than you, as Policy Maker, can raise that issue. But I can’t stop the process. You’re the Policy Maker.”

Commissioner Garza – “Well that’s why I voted against it. But I think that you as Legal Counsel for this Commissioners Court should tell us ‘we are not ready to proceed with this until we have a document that we know is correct to the best of our ability.’ And I know that that was not the case here, because if you just got the information this morning, I mean we’ve been here since eight o’clock Doug. It’s not fair for your Office, but I think you need to tell us.”

(1) PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN OF THE WEST RAIL PROJECT

At this time, Judge Pro-tem Benavides called the Public Hearing to order.

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA RETURNED.

Mr. Tom Ellis, HNTB Engineers, reported that the Environmental Assessment was submitted to the State Department on June 2003 and that they were waiting on comments from the State Attorney General before environmental clearance was obtained. He stated that there has been extensive public involvement process where input was gathered to establish the final corridor alternative that was presented during a Public Hearing held on June 5, 2003. Mr. Ellis stated that as of then they have worked on a detailed alignment to be presented today, and that attempts were made to meet with property owners to be affected by the final alignment. He stated that the process includes right-of-way acquisition to commence immediately after the approval of the finding of no significant impact of the Environmental Assessment and approval of the final alignment by the Court. Mr. Ellis added that the County would start by obtaining approval from landowners to survey the right-of-way taking, would prepare an appraisal, would prepare a plat, and would present an offer letter, noting that landowners had the option to accept or reject the offer.

Mr. Rob Maxwell, Union Pacific Railroad, presented and highlighted four (4) proposed alignments:

Mr. Maxwell stated that the Railroad Bridge was a critical path item that requires a preliminary design that must be coordinated with IBWC, Coast Guard, the Core of Engineers, and the Union Pacific Railroad, noting that the bridge must be planned and designed according to Union Pacific's standards and criteria. He recommended that the project commence by constructing the bridge, and that 1,400 feet rail section continuously welded to be transported by railcar be used by the contractor, as done by Union Pacific.

Mr. Michael Ortiz, County resident, expressed concern with the Engineers not having the names of the property owners correct and with an alignment that was totally different from what he was presented. He suggested that the alignment remained west of a gas pipeline to avoid entering as much into his property.

Mr. John Hudson, HNTB Engineers, stated that the original schematic indicated that 50' of the alignment went into the Coronado property and 50' into the Ortiz property. He explained that the alignment was designed on top of the pipeline but could not be built here.

Mr. Ortiz stated that the schematic indicated that the railroad was not on top of the gas pipeline.

Mr. Hudson stated that the engineer's schematic showed the railroad was within the 30' right-of-way of the pipeline and that the railroad objected to this. He stated that the alignment was revised to place it parallel to the gas pipeline last week because the plans were previously unavailable.

Mr. Ortiz suggested that the railroad stay west to cross the pipeline fewer times.

Mr. Maxwell stated that staying west would cause a sharp curve for trains to run on.

Mr. Ortiz stated that the radius could improve if the alignment was moved further west.

Judge Hinojosa stated the County's Policy on this project has been to adversely affect the least property owners possible, and suggested that the alignment be approved with the understanding that Mr. Ortiz's suggestion be reviewed.

Mr. Ortiz stated that he completely lost confidence in the process because the Engineers claim to meet with the public but were not listening and did not notify the public of changes.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the process includes Public Hearings where the public could be heard by the final decision makers.

Mr. Rick Cardenas, County resident, stated that the at-grade crossing promised back in July 2003 was not done and requested that the matter be addressed and documented.

Judge Hinojosa explained that overpasses and gate arms were approved and built by TXDOT, and that the MPO merely makes recommendations. He stated that access to the property behind Yturria Elementary and a collector road heading north/south to intersect with the collector road was part of the design. Judge Hinojosa stated that he suggested that Mr. Sepulveda and Mr. Hudson tell the MPO to plan for the two (2) roads to meet and to recommend that TXDOT built an overpass or a railroad crossing guard.

Mr. Pete Sepulveda, International Bridge System Director, stated that traffic analysis for northwest Brownsville and specific recommendations prepared by Mr. Hudson at the request of the City of Brownsville and the MPO were being reviewed by the Brownsville MPO. He stated that this was the proper avenue for the County to provide solutions to problems concerning access to properties. Mr. Sepulveda stated that the Brownsville MPO was looking into modifications to the thorough fair plan that consider recommendations made by Mr. Hudson.

Mr. Hudson explained that TXDOT provides 80% of construction cost for an overpass, that 10% must be funded by the entity, and that the remaining 10% must be funded by the railroad. He stated that local entities must agree to have an overpass and that TXDOT must agree to fund it, adding that the request would be placed on a waiting list but would most likely not be funded for undeveloped land.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the Court was requested to ensure that an at-grade crossing be considered for long term plans assuming that the development occurs and the need arises. Judge Hinojosa stated a north/south road was needed north of El Tejon Road to intersect at some point with the east/west collector road, and that the MPO must decide what to do at the railroad.

Commissioner Tamayo noted that TXDOT would not move forward on the project until the need arose.

Mr. Cardenas noted that Collectors No. 3 and 5 have been on the MPO for ten (10) years. He offered to pay for infrastructure up to the railroad, and suggested that the railroad pay for the at-grade crossing. Mr. Cardenas reiterated his request for the at-grade crossing that was needed.

Judge Hinojosa stated that the MPO prepares alternatives and that decisions were made upon a need arising.

Mr. Cardenas requested that the crossing be included in the plans, and stated that the Court instructed that an at-grade crossing be provided but nothing was done.

Commissioner Benavides suggested that the matter be researched in order to possibly commit to providing Mr. Cardenas an at-grade crossing.

Judge Hinojosa reiterated that the decision to provide an at-grade crossing was made by the MPO.

Mr. Cardenas commented that the decisions were made by the Houston Engineers.

Judge Hinojosa explained that the Engineers were not concerned about those issues but rather about building a railroad. He suggested that the two (2) MPO Members on the Court could make recommendations.

Commissioner Benavides suggested that the matter be addressed at the next MPO meeting.

Ms. Reba Cardenas McNair, County resident, expressed concern with recommendations made to the MPO to eliminate Collector No. 3 that has been on the plans for the past ten (10) years and for which the need has not diminished. She stated that the recommendations were made because at-grade crossings would not be allowed by the railroad. Ms. McNair stated that Collector No. 3 still does not have an at-grade crossing to date.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that Mr. Cardenas attend the MPO Meeting scheduled for September 10, 2003.

Mr. Cesar Mendez, County resident, expressed concern with 100 feet to be taken from his father's 8.37 acre property.

Mr. Hudson explained that the Engineers would determine the needed right-of-way, that an appraiser must appraise the property and that upon determining that the entire property was damaged then the entire property must be purchased at a fair compensation, yet if only a portion of the property was damaged then that portion must be purchased.

Judge Hinojosa questioned why the alignment must be north of the drainage ditch as opposed to being south of the drainage ditch.

Mr. Hudson stated that the alignment must be as south as possible staying north of the drainage ditch at the request of property owners.

Mr. Mendez stated that the suggestion was made that the drainage ditch be piped and the railroad placed above.

Mr. Hudson stated that the railroad could cross a drainage ditch but could not run above it.

Upon motion by Commissioner Tamayo, seconded by Commissioner Garza and carried unanimously, the Public Hearing regarding the Schematic Design of the West Rail Project was closed.

The Report is as follows:

(2) **IN THE MATTER REGARDING CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN AND ALIGNMENT OF THE WEST RAIL PROJECT (TABLED)**

Judge Hinojosa recommended that the alignment be approved with the understanding that some of the issues and concerns would be reviewed and that the County would accommodate some of the property owners if possible.

Commissioner Garza suggested that action be postponed for one week.

Mr. John Hudson, HNTB Engineers, requested that the matter be tabled, and stated that this Item would be brought back before the Court once a plan was determined.

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

(10) **CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE BUDGETS FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY GENERAL FUND, CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS, COURTHOUSE SECURITY FUND, THE SPECIAL ROAD AND BRIDGE FUND, THE LATERAL ROADS FUNDS, THE LAW LIBRARY FUND, THE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FUND, THE CHILD SUPPORT FUNDS, THE FIFTH JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION FUNDS, THE DEBT SERVICE FUNDS, THE INTERNATIONAL TOLL BRIDGE SYSTEM FUNDS, THE PARK SYSTEM FUNDS, AND THE AIRPORT FUND FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003-2004**

Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, reported that the General Fund Budget was balanced at \$49,563,596.00 and that the Road & Bridge Fund Budget was balanced at \$7,699,919.00, inclusive of the 3% salary increases, the adjustments made by the Grievance Committee, and the tax rate just below the rollback rate.

Commissioner Garza asked if the need for the County Airport was addressed in the Budget.

Mr. Villarreal explained that Commissioner Garza expressed interest in helping in the preparation of a five (5) year plan for the County Airport which a State Grant was available, in addition to partnerships to be developed with surrounding communities to assist with funding. He recommended that the County commit \$10,000.00 to fund this plan.

Judge Hinojosa suggested that the matter be placed on the Agenda.

Commissioner Garza moved that the Budgets for the Cameron County General Fund, Capital Projects Funds, Courthouse Security Fund, the Special Road and Bridge Fund, the Lateral Roads Funds, the Law Library

Fund, the Employee Benefits Fund, the Child Support Funds, the Fifth Judicial Administrative Region Funds, the Debt Service Funds, the International Toll Bridge System Funds, the Park System Funds, and the Airport Fund for the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 be adopted.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo and carried unanimously.

The Order is as follows:

(11) **CONSIDERATION AND SETTING OF THE COUNTY
TAX RATE FOR THE 2003-2004 FISCAL YEAR**

Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, informed that the rate was at 1/10,000 of a penny below the rollback rate, equaling .358191 per \$100 valuation on the tax role.

Judge Hinojosa stated that 1.7 cents in tax increase totaled \$11.00 per years on a \$60,000.00 home.

Commissioner Garza asked if the penny transfer into Road & Bridge was considered.

Judge Hinojosa stated that .7 of a cent went to General Fund and one penny went to Road & Bridge Fund.

Commissioner Benavides expressed opposition towards increasing taxes.

Commissioner Garza stated that the Road & Bridge Fund Balances could possibly reflect a decrease and that other Fund Balances would remain static compared to the end of 2002. He stated that he did not grieve his salary, and challenged other Members of the Court to give up salary increases if County constituents were being asked to fund their taxes with more dollars.

Commissioner Garza moved that the Order setting of the County Tax Rate for the 2003-2004 Fiscal Year be adopted, as recommended by the Budget Officer.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tamayo.

Mrs. JuaNita Brodecky, Rio Hondo resident, requested that Elected Officials give up their 3% salary increases because it was unjust for them accept salary increases when others were suffering. She stated that tax payers have just paid \$6,000.00 in fines for illegal dumping and that they don't see why these matters occur. Mrs. Brodecky questioned why Elected Officials must get an increase when they knew what the salary was when they first came into Office.

Commissioner Tamayo commented that she spent money out of her pocket to fund some Learning Centers.

Mr. Dagoberto Barrera, Brownsville resident, stated that the silent tax assessor/collector has already increased taxes, and recommended that the County be tougher on collecting taxes.

Mr. Manuel Hernandez, Brownsville resident, expressed opposition towards tax increases, and questioned if democracy was at work. He expressed concern with numerous cuts to health benefits, and stated that people were unhappy of how Local, State, and Federal Governments were operating.

Upon motion duly made by Commissioner Garza that the Order setting of the County Tax Rate for the 2003-2004 Fiscal Year be adopted, as recommended by the Budget Officer.

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

AYE: Commissioners Wood, Garza, Tamayo, and Judge Hinojosa

NAY: Commissioner Benavides

At this time, Mr. Xavier Villarreal, Budget Officer, read the tax rates.

The Order and the Report are as follow:

CONSENT ITEMS

ALL ITEMS UNDER THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS WERE HEARD COLLECTELY UNLESS OPPOSITION WAS PRESENTED, IN WHICH CASE THE CONTESTED ITEM WAS CONSIDERED, DISCUSSED, AND APPROPRIATE ACTION WAS TAKEN SEPARATELY.

DISCUSSION CONCERNING CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO. 17: Mr. Remi Garza, County Administrative Assistant, stated that this Item was placed here as a result of the hiring freeze recently adopted by the Court. Commissioner Garza questioned if the positions were vacant. Mr. Garza responded in the affirmative.

ITEM NO. 20: Commissioner Garza questioned if the in-kind had been budgeted. Mr. Remi Garza, County Administrative Assistant, responded in the affirmative.

ITEM NO. 21: Commissioner Wood questioned if the water from the wells was potable. Mr. Juan Bernal, County Engineer/Public Works Director, responded that the water would be analyzed and that a report would be provided. The suggestion was made that approval be made subject to the Report being provided.

ITEM NO. 14: Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, presented the following late claims: Warrant No. 00102600, loan to Equipment List, in the amount of \$5,000.00; Warrant No. 00102601, loan to Jury Fund, in the amount of \$3,811.00; Warrant No. 00102602, loan to Fund No. 4, in the amount of \$300.00; Warrant No. 00102603, loan to General Fund, in the amount of \$124,500.00; and Warrant No. 00102604, loan for other Governmental Elections, in the amount of \$2,000.00.

ITEM NO. 22-b: Mrs. JuaNita Brodecky commented against this Item and Health Department Personnel. Judge Hinojosa stated that calling County employees names was wrong, and warned that if Mrs. Brodecky expected to be recognized that she must be respectful to County employees. Commissioner Garza stated that attendance was a requirement.

ITEM NO. 21: Mr. Doug Wright, Commissioners' Court Legal Counsel, questioned the direction of this Item. Commissioner Wood suggested building permits not be issued until potable water was available.

Commissioner Garza moved that the following "Consent and Travel Items", be approved, inclusive of the late claims, and that Item No. 21 be approved subject to the Report and legal approval.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Garza, and Tamayo,

NAY: Commissioner Wood as to Item No. 17.

ABSTAIN: Judge Hinojosa as to Warrant No. 00102502, payable to Laguna Madre Water District, in the amount of \$184.08

**(13) APPROVAL OF CLAIMS:
The Affidavit follows:**

**(14) POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES WITH MR.NATHANIEL C. PEREZ, JR. TO PROVIDE LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO THE INDIGENT DEFENDANTS OF THE 107TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT;
The Contract follows:**

- (15) **ACTION CONFIRMING THE SAFEKEEPING OF THE COUNTY DEPOSITORY BANK LETTER OF CREDIT IN THE COUNTY TREASURER'S SAFE;**
- (16) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT AND MOBILE IMAGING X-RAY, ULTRASOUND AND EKG FOR RADIOLOGICAL SERVICES;**
The Contract follows:
- (17) **AUTHORIZATION TO HIRE ONE LICENSED VOCATIONAL NURSE FOR THE JAIL INFIRMARY;**
- (18) **AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT TO SUBMIT FOR FUNDING OF SITE II FOR FEDERAL GRANT WEED AND SEED;**
The Resolution follows:
- (19) **AUTHORIZATION FOR JANITORIAL SERVICES CONTRACT TO BE RENEWED FOR FISCAL YEAR 03/04 FOR THE ENGINEERING & RIGHT-OF-WAY DEPARTMENT OFFICES;**
The Contract follows:
- (20) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF TITLE V GRANT AWARD IN THE AMOUNT OF \$132,075.00 FOR PROGRAM YEAR 9-1-03 TO 8-31-04; AND**
The Acceptance Notice follows:
- (21) **AUTHORIZATION FOR FINAL APPROVAL:**
 - A. **PRECINCT 4- HERNANDEZ & GONZALEZ SUBDIVISION, BEING 10.00 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE NORTH 10.00 ACRES BLOCK 87, HOOKS & HODGES SUBDIVISION NO. 1, CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS.**

TRAVEL ITEMS

- (22) **CONSIDERATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL/OR APPROVAL OF TRAVEL EXPENSE FOR THE FOLLOWING (PLEASE NOTE: TRAVEL REQUESTS ARE SUBJECT TO ALL APPLICABLE COUNTY POLICIES):**
 - A. Sheriff's Office Sergeant And Deputy, To Travel to El Paso, Texas, On 9/28-10/4/03, and To Attend an Advanced Specialized Narcotics Interdiction Seminar.
 - B. Health Department Employee, To Travel To Corpus Christi, Texas, On 11/10-11/03, To Attend a Breastfeeding Phase I Training.
 - C. Extension Office Employees (4), To Travel to El Campo, TX, On 9/4-6/03, To Attend the South Region Re-Organization Meeting.
 - D. Juvenile Probation Employee, To Travel To Austin, TX, On 9/3-4/03, To Attend "Compliance Resource Manual Chapter 343 Workshop".
 - E. District Attorney's Office Employee, To Travel to Corpus Christi, On 9/24-26/03, To Attend the Texas District & Counties Association Annual Board Member Meeting and Dace Annual Criminal and Civil Law Update.
 - F. DPMI Employee, To Travel To Weslaco, Texas, On 9/11/03, To Attend The Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting.
 - G. DPMI Employee, To Travel to Mercedes, Texas, On 9/10/03, To Attend Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council Professional Advisory Review Panel Meeting

- (13) **APPROVAL OF CLAIMS:**
The Affidavit follows:

- (14) **POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES WITH MR.NATHANIEL C. PEREZ, JR. TO PROVIDE LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO THE INDIGENT DEFENDANTS OF THE 107TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT.**
The Contract follows:

- (16) **APPROVAL OF CONTRACT BETWEEN CAMERON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT AND MOBILE IMAGING X-RAY, ULTRASOUND AND EKG FOR RADIOLOGICAL SERVICES.**
The Contract follows:

- (18) **AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CAMERON COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT TO SUBMIT FOR FUNDING OF SITE II FOR FEDERAL GRANT WEED AND SEED.**
The Resolution follows:

- (19) **AUTHORIZATION FOR JANITORIAL SERVICES CONTRACT TO BE RENEWED FOR FISCAL YEAR 03/04 FOR THE ENGINEERING & RIGHT-OF-WAY DEPARTMENT OFFICES.**
The Contract follows:

- (20) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF TITLE V GRANT AWARD IN THE AMOUNT OF \$132,075.00 FOR PROGRAM YEAR 9-1-03 TO 8-31-04; AND
The Acceptance Notice follows:**

EXECUTIVE SESSION

(23) **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

- (a) **In the matter regarding deliberation of the evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of the Cameron County Public Works Director; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.) Government Code, Section 551.074 (A) (TABLED).**

Commissioner Benavides moved that this Item be **TABLED**.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Wood, Tamayo, and Judge Hinojosa,

NAY: Commissioner Garza.

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

- (a) In the matter regarding deliberation of evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of the Cameron County Public Works Director. **(NO ACTION TAKEN)**
-

There being no further business to come before the Court, upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Wood and carried unanimously, the meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 12:35 P.M.

APPROVED this 4th day of **November** 2003.

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

ATTEST:

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