

THE STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF CAMERON

BE IT REMEMBERED on the 25th day of MARCH, 1997, 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:

4:00 P. M.

PRESENT:

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

PEDRO "PETE" BENAVIDES
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 1

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

JAMES R. MATZ
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 3

HECTOR PEÑA
COMMISSIONER, PRECINCT NO. 4

Hilda V. Treviño Deputy
COUNTY CLERK

ABSENT:

The meeting was called to order by Judge Pro-tem Carlos H. Cascos. He then asked the Court to 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 March 21, 1997, at 8:46 A.M., and the Supplemental Notice posted on March 21, 1997, at 3:13 P.M.:

(1) **AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN BIDS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

- a) Request for Proposal No. 97-03-02 for fuel sites - Automatic Tank Gauge System;
- b) Air condition and heat units (quantity six) - Detention Center I; and
- c) Request for Proposal No. 97-02-05 for Rural Satellite Law Enforcement Office - architectural design.

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA JOINED THE MEETING AT THIS TIME.

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Bids/Request for Proposals were opened.

The Bids/Request for Proposals are as follow:

(1) AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN BIDS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- a) **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 97-03-02 FOR FUEL SITES - AUTOMATIC TANK GAUGE SYSTEM**

The Bids/Request for Proposal are as follow:

(1) AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN BIDS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- b) AIR CONDITION AND HEAT UNITS
(QUANTITY 6) - DETENTION
CENTER I**

The Bids/Request for Proposals are as follow:

(1) AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN BIDS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- c) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 97-02-
05 FOR RURAL SATELLITE LAW
ENFORCEMENT OFFICE -
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN**

The Bids/Request for Proposals are as follow:

(2) EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Court met in Executive Session at 4:10 P.M. to discuss the following matters:

- a) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Mary Lou Munivez vs. Luis V. Saenz, B-96-032, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, for the discussion of the status of the case and authority to settle; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071 (1)(a)(b);
- b) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Manuel Hinojosa, III vs. Cameron County and Constable Mike Barberena, Precinct No. 1, for the discussion of the claim and settlement of the case; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071(1)(a)(b);
- c) Deliberation regarding the Real Property pertaining to the acquisition of the land adjoining the Cameron Park Community Center for the Cameron Park Recreation Project; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.072; and
- d) Confer with County Counsel concerning the potential litigation regarding the Adult Probation Office Project; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071 (1)(A&B).

The Court reconvened in Regular Session at 5:15 P.M.

██

At this time, Judge Hinojosa 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.

██

(3) ACTION RELATIVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Mary Lou Munivez vs. Luis V. Saenz, B-96-032, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas for the discussion of the status of the case and for authority to settle.

Commissioner Matz recommended that the Status Report of County Counsel should be acknowledged regarding said matter.

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Status Report by County Counsel was acknowledged regarding the case styled Mary Lou Munivez vs. Luis V. Saenz, B-96-032, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

- b) Confer with County Counsel on the case styled Manuel Hinojosa, III vs. Cameron County and Constable Mike Barberena, Precinct No. 1, for the discussion of the claim and settlement of the case.

Judge Hinojosa recommended that the Status Report of County Counsel should be acknowledged regarding said matter.

Commissioner Peña moved that the Status Report by County Counsel be acknowledged regarding the claim and settlement of the case styled Manuel Hinojosa, III vs. Cameron County and Constable Mike Barberena, Precinct No. 1.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously.

- c) Deliberation regarding the Real Property pertaining to the acquisition of the land adjoining the Cameron Park Community Center for the Cameron Park Recreation Project .

Mr. Doug Wright, Cameron County Counsel, recommended that the Status Report of the Parks System Director and the Program Development and Management Director should be acknowledged regarding said matter.

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Status Report by the Parks System Director and the Program Development and Management Director was acknowledged regarding the Real Property pertaining to the acquisition of the land adjoining the Cameron Park Community Center for the Cameron Park Recreation Project .

- d) Confer with County Counsel concerning the potential litigation regarding the Adult Probation Office Project.

Commissioner Matz recommended that the Status Report by County Counsel should be acknowledged regarding said matter.

Commissioner Matz moved that the Status Report by County Counsel be acknowledged regarding the potential litigation of the Adult Probation Office Project.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE

(1) EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a) Confer with County Counsel regarding the hiring of outside Counsel for the Los Tomates International Bridge Project; pursuant to Vernon Texas Code Annotated (V.T.C.A.), Government Code, Section 551.071 (2).

(2) ACTION RELATIVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a) Confer with County Counsel regarding the hiring of outside Counsel for the Los Tomates International Bridge Project.

Mr. Doug Wright, Cameron County Counsel, recommended that the County Judge and the County Auditor should be authorized to negotiate said matter with the Bickerstat Law Firm, along the terms and conditions as determined in Executive Session.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the County Judge and the County Auditor were authorized to negotiate with the Bickerstat Law Firm, along the terms and conditions as determined in Executive Session, regarding outside Counsel for the Los Tomates International Bridge Project.



(4) APPROVAL OF COUNTY CLAIMS

NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA LEFT THE COURT ROOM.

Upon motion by Judge Pro-tem Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, the County Claims were approved as presented by the County Auditor.

The Budget Officer's Comments Report is as follows:

(6) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 1997, AND MARCH 10, 1997

At this time, Judge Pro-tem Cascos expressed concern regarding the inconsistencies as to the Department Heads= review and approval of the Salary Schedules and he suggested that the Salary Schedules be signed by the Department Heads before being submitted to the Court for approval.

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Judge Pro-tem Cascos and carried unanimously, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held March 4, 1997, at 4:00 P.M., and the Special Meeting held March 10, 1997, at 4:00 P.M., were approved, subject to the corrections noted.



NOTE: JUDGE HINOJOSA RETURNED TO THE COURT ROOM.

(5) APPROVAL OF BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND/OR SALARY SCHEDULES

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Salary Schedules for the District Attorney/Unified Intelligence Task Force, Fund No. 22-472 and the Parks System - Isla Blanca, Fund No. 83-660, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

The Salary Schedules are as follow:

(7) **PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT
BY TROOPER T. J. CESPEDES OF THE TEXAS
HIGHWAY PATROL, REGARDING THE
STATISTICS ON CITATIONS ISSUED FROM
1994, 1995 AND 1996**

At this time, Trooper Teodoso J. Cespedes, Texas Department of Public Safety, highlighted the Progress Report of the Texas Highway Patrol regarding the statistics on citations and warnings issued from 1994, 1995 and 1996.

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Progress Report by Trooper Teodoso J. Cespedes of the Texas Highway Patrol, regarding the Statistics on Citations issued from 1994, 1995 and 1996, be acknowledged.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

The Report is as follows:

**(8) PRESENTATION OF THE ANNUAL
INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION
REPORT BY FARAKLAS ENGINEERING,
INCORPORATED**

At this time, Mr. Luis T. Faraklas, P.E., Faraklas Engineering, Incorporated, highlighted the 1996 Annual Inspection Report for the Gateway International Bridge and the Los Indios Free Trade Bridge.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cascos, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the Annual International Bridge Inspection Report by Faraklas Engineering, Incorporated, San Antonio, Texas, was acknowledged.

The Reports are as follow:

(9) AUTHORIZATION OF THE PURCHASE WITHOUT THE PURCHASE ORDER, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$362.75, FROM COOPER EQUIPMENT COMPANY

Commissioner Peña moved that the Purchase without the Purchase Order, in the amount of \$362.75, from Cooper Equipment Company, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

(10) IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING TO DETERMINE THE STATUS (PUBLIC OR PRIVATE) OF NO NAME ROAD LEADING TO LEAL SUBDIVISION (NO ACTION TAKEN)

At this time, Commissioner Peña stated that Basically, I have a petition here that I would like to put in for the record. These people here from Leal Subdivision petitioned that they have witnessed that the road has been used since its inception of the Colonia or the Subdivision and that they have witnessed County property and equipment being used in that Subdivision. They are here to testify upon that, if you would like to listen to their testimony. Basically a public road has characteristics, and one of the characteristics: its been used by the public since the creation or inception of that type of Colonia. And, basically the things that I have looked at, I consider this being a very public road. It has more characteristics of any public road than anything else. And, I am asking the Court to help me and support basically to find the fact that this is a public road.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned Any comments from the public?®

At this time, former Commissioner Tivie Valencia, Precinct No. 4, stated This item has been brought three (3) times before on behalf of Commissioner Peña. Commissioners and Judge I want you to realize that this is an illegal subdivision. It has been for years and years. Even though throughout the time that I was in Office eight (8) years, we tried very hard to get this Colonia to the County to improve to a legal subdivision. For some reason it could not be done. I know it still is an illegal subdivision. Commissioner Peña says that he has a petition from the people here in the Colonia. We had several meetings on this Colonia especially during the time after the 1991 flood. We had an emergency and I think, I am not sure that we did use some equipment for this Colonia. We also were able to bring our County personnel to San Benito, even though it was a city, the Court allowed us to. In reference to the petition, I do not now how this petition came about, but I have witnesses that I have here a former foreman from Precinct No. 4, Mr. David Lopez. And also we have three (3) other employees who worked while my time, and they are here to testify that we never worked on that road.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned Let me ask, Frank, on the Subdivision, do they have water?®

Commissioner Peña responded ASure they do. They have water and sewer.®

Mr. Frank Bejarano, Program Development and Management Director, replied AThey have water and septic tanks.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned AAnd they have electrical stuff. Have we ever made an effort to try to legalize the subdivision?®

Mr. Bejarano replied AThe subdivision is an illegally platted subdivision. When Commissioner Valencia was here in 1994, and throughout 1994 we got a Planning Grant to do a preliminary plat study. That study was completed, but there was no money to do a final plat. It is my understanding that if we are talking about improvements inside the subdivision and that it is not clear to me from the wording on the Agenda. If we are talking about improvements inside the subdivision, the property has to be legally platted before you can do improvements or else you run contrary to the County Subdivision Ordinance, and if you do that, then you jeopardize potential grant funds. That has been our position and it has been explained to the Commissioners.®

Commissioner Peña replied AI understand that. But, this is a public road. That is what we are trying to determine and the Commissioners Court has authority to issue on the public road or not.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AMy concern was not so much that. If we make a determination that it is a public road then it is not part of the subdivision, it is a public road. And, I think that is the issue here before us. But my concern why had we not done, I mean what do we need to do to legalize the subdivision?®

Mr. Bejarano stated AWhen we did the preliminary plat study, it was the same time that we did Sunny Skies, which is also an illegal subdivision. You would need to do the same thing that you did with Sunny Skies, which is earmark money from a different set aside to plat the property and do any improvements if you want to. In this case, well, we just finished the 1997 Community Development Program but that would have been one opportunity to plat the property and do improvements.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned AIs there a reason why we have not submitted this as one of our Community Development?®

Mr. Bejarano responded AIt is on the list of projects that was presented to you from past years. Every year we give you a list of projects that come in that year, and then we give you a running tab of projects from previous years that have not been implemented yet, and I believe it is on that list.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AWell, I would like for us to get this thing taken care of once and for all. I mean, this is aside from the issue whether it is a public road or not, because I think these people deserve it. Regardless of what happened in the past, we need to get this illegal subdivision legalized.®

Mr. Bejarano stated AThe only source of money though, is your Community Development Funds.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AI know that and we have already booked that for a couple of years.®

Mr. Bejarano stated AThe only thing I am thinking Judge, is we have had different cost estimates on the Valle Escondido Project and we are meeting tomorrow on the Budget. If for some reason there is any money left over in that Budget, and we do not go up to the \$348,000.00 that we have, you might consider assigning some of that.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned AHow much would it cost for us more or less?®

Mr. Bejarano responded ATo do a final plat? Plus or minus and Juan can direct me, you are looking at maybe \$5,000.00.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AWe need to do this. We need to get this thing taken care of.®

Mr. Bejarano stated AFor a final plat, you cannot get a final plat approved until you have money showing on the table for the improvements. That is the way the process works.®

Judge Hinojosa questioned AWhat improvements are we looking at besides fixing the road?®

Mr. Bejarano replied ARoad Improvements, drainage perhaps. And, if I understand it the septic tanks meet County Standards so you can plat it showing septic tanks.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AWe can plat that thing and the expenditures that particularly the ones that we would commit towards the road and maybe some drainage work which you can do.®

Commissioner Peña stated ADrainage is minimal, all that it is minimal.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AI mean, I think we would have enough.®

Commissioner Valencia stated AI would be thrilled. I would be very happy for these people, very happy to get their services done to get the roads going. I worked very hard for that purpose.®

Commissioner Peña questioned ASo you support the concept?®

Commissioner Valencia replied AThat is fine with me, but let's do it legally.®

At this time, Commissioner Matz stated AJudge could I mention two (2) things, please, that have to do with the Subdivision itself? First the County did get a judgement against the developer in 1994 for \$29,000.00.®

Commissioner Peña questioned AThe developer is? Who is the developer? Jose Alfredo Leal? Where is Alfredo Leal? He already passed away?®

Commissioner Matz stated AHe passed away, o.k. So, there is an outstanding judgement which is now over \$50,000.00.®

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, stated AThat is correct.®

Commissioner Peña replied AGo to the State, I guess.®

Commissioner Matz stated AWell, I just want to make that part of the record. And I think that has been part of the problem.®

Commissioner Peña responded AI understand that James. But, you cannot be penalizing these people on the developer-s fault. If you want to get, go to the State.®

Commissioner Matz stated ASecondly, there was a County Engineer-s Memorandum done back in June of 1990, which did a cost estimate for the interior roads and also for the exterior roads, including the cost of Right-of-Way. And according to that letter, which is in the previous packet from the previous Meeting, in which I just passed out again, the cost for the interior roads, to answer your question Judge, at that point was roughly \$54,000.00. The exterior road at that point in time was going to cost around \$59,000.00 in the forty foot (40') and not sixty foot (60') Right-of-Way acquisition, which is supposed to cost another \$12,000.00 so that would get it up to \$72,000.00 on a forty foot (40') Right-of-Way, which is not County Standard.®

Commissioner Cascos questioned ADon-t we have County. Let me ask, Hector, because you have done all this research on it. Don-t we have a Policy regarding the acceptance of roads into the County System, No. 1? And No. 2, if we do, is there not a minimum criteria as far as the width or the Right-of-Way that we must have? And No. 3, if in fact the first two are answerable >yes- and sixty feet (60') or whatever, does this road meet that criteria?®

Commissioner Peña responded ABasically the road does not meet all the criteria asking for, but...®

Commissioner Cascos questioned ADoes it meet any of the criteria?®

Commissioner Peña replied AYeah, the minimum says that there is fifty foot (50') on there and they said they can do it on that. It is sixty feet (60'), but there is a fifty feet (50') Right-of-Way they could work on. We can get ten (10) more right-of-way feet. That is what they were asking for.®

Commissioner Cascos questioned AO.k., but should we not, before we even discuss accepting it into the County, determining it is public, should we not try to acquire that additional ten feet (10') of Right-of-Way, or whatever it is to make it right prior to the acceptance? Can we do that as part of this deal?®

Commissioner Peña responded AI do not know if we can do part of that deal right now. But, I would like to.®

Commissioner Cascos questioned AWhy not?®

Commissioner Peña replied AYou can ask them to give the Right-of-Way, but the Right-of-Way, I would assume would be given. I am not to sure on this point.®

At this time, Mr. Doug Wright, Cameron County Counsel, stated AWell, one of the problems you have when you acquire a road, a public road by prescriptive easement is part of the facts that the Court has to find is what your

prescriptive easement entails. But you have to have a description of the road with length and where it starts and where it stops. And, I have not heard any of that. So, that is an issue that is being presented.®

Commissioner Matz replied AWhat is on the Agenda is twenty feet (20') wide.®

Commissioner Cascos stated ALet me try to close my part of this. O.k. if we have a County Policy in place that says that we are not going to be accepting County roads into the system unless they meet minimum Standards, o.k. Then am I hearing the Court right, or the majority of the members of the Court it seems to be, that we are going to violate the Policy for now or make an exception to the Policy, No. 1. No. 2, if part of the Policy says that we must have sixty feet (60') of Right-of-Way and we only have forty (40) or fifty (50) or whatever the number is, are we again going to make an exception to the Rule. And then, what is going to happen in future endeavors when other people come to us and say ACan you please make an exception to the Right-of-Way Policy because my road is only fifty feet (50') or thirty feet (30') or twenty feet (20').® When and where and how do we draw the line? If we have the Rules in place, which are sixty feet (60') feet of Right-of-Way, is there a really a good reason to violate it, or should we not try to acquire the sixty feet (60') or whatever we need prior to the discussion of whether we are going to deem it public or private. Why is it that we cannot do that? And, that way we do not violate County Policy in that respect. Why can we go and try to acquire the thirty hundred and some odd feet of Right-of-Way that we need, ten feet (10') across or whatever it is, and then bring it back and then see if it meets the smell test? I mean why do we need to rush into this and violate County Policy on two different levels? I guess that is my concern.®

Commissioner Peña responded AWell, the concern is basically that we have health problems. Those issues come in place from the drainage and those things. Now, allow me to work on the drainage and then work on the easements from there, I could live with that. But, the drainage has become a real serious problem because of the flooding. Allow me to work on that.®

Commissioner Cascos replied ABut, I do not know that we can allow an illegal action.®

Commissioner Peña responded AThis is not an illegal action. No. 1, we are determining what is a public road. And No. 2, we decide to bring it into the County System or we do not. That is all the issues at this point.®

Commissioner Cascos stated ALet-s deal with the first one though, whether it is a public or private road. But again, if we get passed the private/public issue, are we going to violate or go against the Policy that this Court set years back.®

Commissioner Peña stated AYears back. Then we need to revisit the Policy.®

Commissioner Cascos stated AYou know, Hector, with all due respect, this is not a thirty year old Policy, this is only about a four to five year Policy. It is not this old. So, I mean are we going to shrink the Right-of-Way now to make some accommodations or do we want to go back and stay at the sixty feet (60') of Right-of-Way?

Commissioner Peña stated AWell, we usually stay at, we are usually at the sixty foot (60') Right-of-Way all the time. There are County roads that may or may not have that.®

Commissioner Cascos stated ACounty roads, not private roads.®

Commissioner Peña stated AWell, this is not a private road. This is a public road.®

Commissioner Cascos stated AWell, I do not think that determination has been made yet. Once we allow this, then you are opening up the flood gates to other similar type complaints. And think of a city when they annex area, cities can barely take care of what they got. They annex an area and you know that their services failed as well. If we are having a hard time with our Road and Bridge monies to make allocations and it is a battle every year, then how if we cannot take care of what we got, why do we stand ready to be annexing, so to speak, or accepting additional roads into the system, if we cannot take care of the roads that we have now?®

Commissioner Peña replied ABut, those are fiscal decisions that we need to make.®

At this time, Judge Hinojosa stated AOne side is saying that there was work done, one side is saying that there was no work done. I think it ultimately, it comes down to the issue; does the majority of this County Commissioners= Court feel that the road needs to be repaired and fixed so that the people can have access. And I will tell you my feeling; I am not here to say that Tivie Valencia=s crews did not work on it, or did work on it. That is not my concern. My concern is that I believe that there people should have a road so that the buses can go in there and the children can get picked up and any hazards that are there, with respect to the transportation system are taken care of. My feeling is that when you got a situation here, then you give the benefit of the doubt to do what is right, in terms of repairing that road. That is where I am coming from. The point is that we have a problem and we need to take care of the problem. Let=s talk about this for a second, in terms of what we can do. What I would like to do is this; I would like for us to acquire that additional, as much as we can acquire in that particular situation. If there is not ten feet (10') of Right-of-Way, how much can we acquire? Can we acquire seven feet (7')? Can we acquire five feet (5')? Whatever we can acquire, let us acquire that Right-of-Way and let=s build the road the way it is supposed to be built. And, if you can make that commitment to me that is what you are going to do, this is a situation where there is enough people that are affected by this that sometimes we have got to bend the rules a little tiny bit. The Developer is gone. There is nobody that is getting a personal interest on this thing other than this is a community issue. And, that is the way that I think we

need to do it. If you can tell me that you all will acquire that property and work towards expanding that road as close as possible towards the sixty foot (60') then I think that we need to go ahead and do it.®

Commissioner Benavides stated AAnd, I want to agree with you Judge, and I want to say to Commissioner Peña that I will go as far as letting you borrow my crew to go and fix whatever you have to even digging through my Budget. Yes, I will do that for you. I know all these people come here for because they are interested in repairing their road and they come from very far to ask us for assistance and that is what I want to do. But, like the Judge said, let us do this the right way. Let us do this right. And with pleasure, we have the majority of the votes here to repair the road. I do not know any of you but I do know the people who have a necessity and I know you have the necessity to repair the road and with much pleasure you have my vote.®

Commissioner Matz stated AJudge, I would like to go on the record here on two or three things. What your suggesting is a little bending of the rules, throws out...®

Judge Hinojosa stated AIf that is a rule. I am not familiar with this regulation.®

Commissioner Matz replied AOur County Road Acceptance Policy. There is copy of it right there in that packet. Because what we have done is over time establish a Policy, and this is before I got on the Court and I think before Carlos got on the Court for a very good reason. And I think Carlos made the point; we got more than we can say grace over right now. I know Hector has got the same problem I do. We have got roads that have been accepted in the County Road System that we cannot improve because we do not have the resources. And it is the same issues; it is safety, it is school buses. Secondly, we are not only going to be throwing out the County Road Acceptance Policy, because there is no way Judge that you can sit here today and bend the rules a little bit and not have a group of folks showing up at every County Commissioners= Court from now until you are off the bench asking for the same thing. And, I can assure you there is not enough money to do all things you want to do. No. 3...®

Judge Hinojosa replied ACommissioner you never had any problems bending the rules in changing the rules. You wanted to change the rules the other day when we were talking about bringing in more Deputy Constables for Constable Barberena. You did not have any problems changing that rule. All of a sudden you have a problem changing this rule.®

Commissioner Matz questioned AMay I continue please?®

Judge Hinojosa replied AYeah, that is fine, but do not be preaching to me about bending the rules.®

Commissioner Matz responded AI will continue to preach. As a matter of fact they are very different issues. I will wait until you can listen Judge, because it is important for your education.®

Judge Hinojosa replied AI do not need you to educate me Commissioner. If anybody needs to be educated, it is you.®

Commissioner Matz stated ANo. 3, I would also like to mention that if this Court votes 3 to 2 on this thing, to do what I have heard wants to be done, we are also going to be throwing out our Cameron County Special Assessments Policy, which was developed about three and a half years ago to address this very specific kind of situation. Now, Pete are you familiar with the Special Assessment Policy?®

Commissioner Benavides responded ANot a lot. But all I am saying is; let us Table it. Get the Right-of-Way and let-s do it right like we are doing the one on the...®

Commissioner Cascos stated AThat is it. Let us go ahead and do that for now, James. Let us go ahead and Table it until we acquire.®

Judge Hinojosa clarified ALet us find out what we are agreeing to. You are agreeing to Table it so that we can acquire the Right-of-Way and go ahead and fix up the road? Is that your position?®

Commissioner Cascos responded ANo. What I am saying, Judge, we cannot even address improving the road until we acquire enough Right-of-Way. Let us at least get part of this thing into some kind of compliance because as Frances indicated; her and her group is going to come by next week and say Aa.k. guys, I do not have enough width on my road but I need some help out here® and we are going to have to either tell her yes or we are going to have to be forced to tell her yes, because we are doing it over here. I think, let us at least get that right. Acquire enough Right-of-Way and then we can address the public/private issue.®

Commissioner Matz stated AIf I could also mention in the Special Assessment Policy, there are steps we go through and I would strongly urge Pete, when you have a chance to read it, Judge, when you have a chance to read it. And also, Hector did you have a chance to read it? We have a situation in Anaquitos Estates. It is a subdivision. We have been working with them for over three (3) years, in order to have that road improved, to be brought into the County Road System. Every property owner has donated Right-of-Way. The County now has sixty feet (60') of Right-of-Way. We have done the engineering, we have come with the cost estimates and over seventy percent (70%) of the people have agreed to participate in the cost of the improvement of that road. We are trying to figure out where we go from here. This is a process which is established to address this very specific kind of situation. I think we need to stick to the County Road Acceptance Policy and the Special Assessment Policy.®

Commissioner Peña stated AI disagree with that. Basically we can address the Right-of-Way issues, we can address all those things and still get the work done. And that is the commitment that I make to you.®

Commissioner Benavides stated AI am doing the same thing at one place over here. We went, we hired a guy to get a subdivision illegalities. We want the same thing to be done on this thing.®

Mr. Wright stated APerhaps the finding of the public road is easier than keying in on the fact that the County has either worked on it or not worked on it. There can be a public road. You can make the administrative finding that there is a public road simply by the fact that the public has continued to used this for a period of ten years, that is your prescriptive easement. The fact that the County has worked on it, only lends evidence to that. So, make that determination and you can take that step to the point of determining what you have is an easement right now. That is something that the County needs to look at, because once you start taking it, take the next step and take it into the County System, then you better be raising that road up to the standards of today=s standards because the County then has the liability.®

Judge Hinojosa stated ALet me suggest something then. You want to make a motion. There are two issues here and we can do with your issue on the second issue. You want to make a motion to determine the status of the road as a public road. Do you want to second that motion or not?®

Commissioner Benavides responded AWell, what I wanted to do is to do what is legal.®

Judge Hinojosa stated AHe said that is not a problem with respect to whether or not you can make a determination that it is a public road. That is not the issue as to whether or not you can repair it or bring it up to standards. That is a different issue that will be on the second item, the second matter on the Agenda.®

Mr. Wright stated AWhen you define a public road, you have to have dimensions to it. You got to have some facts before you make that determination.®

Judge Hinojosa responded AWell, I thought we had the dimensions, which are the dimensions?®

Commissioner Peña questioned AYou have the dimensions of Leal Subdivision roads?®

Mr. Carlos Sanchez, Engineering Department, replied AWe have a plat survey.®

Commissioner Peña questioned AWhat does the survey say on that?®

Mr. Sanchez replied AIt shows the dimensions.®

Mr. Juan Bernal, County Engineer, clarified AIt has fifty feet (50') of Right-of-Way.®

Judge Hinojosa stated ASo you can go ahead and approve the public road nature of that and on the second issue we can deal with what you are concurring about, in terms with the acquisition of the property.®

Mr. Wright stated AO. K. So the Court, when it makes the determination administratable that you have that public easement, roadway easement, the County does not at that point take on any responsibility as far as repairing. The next step is define that and then...®

Commissioner Peña moved that the road leading to the Leal Subdivision be declared a public road, without any commitment on repairs yet.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides.

Commissioner Cascos questioned AJudge, before we vote, I know you said no commitments. Does that mean if we take into the Public System it is going to be conditional that we, in other words we are going to be ready to violate the County Policy? I would like to ask Commissioner Peña. Can you commit that you will not entertain the violation of County Policy as far as accepting the road into the County System?@

Commissioner Peña responded AThat is not what I am committing to, basically, No. 1 we want to find if it is a public.@

Commissioner Matz clarified AAs I understand it, Doug all this is saying is that we got prescriptive rights?@

Mr. Wright replied AYou have got to base it on facts.@

Judge Hinojosa responded AWe have the plat that is part of, I am satisfied that there is a dimension.@

The following individual expressed support regarding said issue:

Mr. Giver Torres, Leal Subdivision resident.

The following individuals expressed their opposition regarding said matter during the discussion:

Former Commissioner Tivie Valencia, Precinct No.4,

Ms. Frances Domanski, El Ranchito resident,

Mr. Baldemar Sanchez, former Right-of-Way Agent Precinct No. 4,

Ms. JuaNita Brodecky, Rio Hondo resident, and

Mr. David Lopez, former Precinct No. 4 Foreman.

Commissioner Peña moved that the status (public or private) of no name road leading to Leal Subdivision be declared as a Public Road, without commitments as to the road repairs yet.

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

AYE: Commissioners Benavides, Peña and Judge Hinojosa

NAY: Commissioners Cascos and Matz, due to lack of facts.

The Petitions and the Policy are as follow:

(11) **IN THE MATTER CONCERNING THE PUBLIC ROAD LEADING INTO THE LEAL SUBDIVISION, TO BE ACCEPTED INTO THE COUNTY SYSTEM AND AUTHORIZED THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE (TABLED)**

At this time, Judge Hinojosa suggested that the Commissioner Precinct No. 4 should be authorized to utilize the Right-of-Way Agent from Precinct No. 1 to work for acquiring the sixty feet (60') of Right-of-Way for purposes of the construction of a full County Road in Precinct No. 4.

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, this Item was **TABLED** and the Precinct No. 1 Right-of-Way Agent was authorized to work towards acquiring the property to sixty feet (60') of Right-of-Way for Precinct No. 4.

(12) **AUTHORIZATION TO REFUND TAXES TO MOBILFONE SERVICE, INCORPORATED - \$596.96 DELETE TAXES, BUSINESS SOLD**

Commissioner Cascos moved that the taxes be refunded to Mobilfone Service, Incorporated - \$596.96 delete taxes, business sold.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously.

(13) **APPROVAL TO OPEN THE FOLLOWING NON-INTEREST BEARING, DDA ACCOUNT WITH THE INTERNATIONAL BANK OF COMMERCE: CAMERON COUNTY TREASURER - EDAP WATER AND SEWER FUND NO. 70**

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, the Cameron County Treasurer - EDAP Water and Sewer Fund No. 70 - Non-Interest Bearing, Demand Deposit Account (DDA) was opened with the International Bank of Commerce.

The Contract is as follows:

(14) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE MONTHLY REPORT(S) AS REQUIRED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTION 114.026 FOR THE MONTHS OF OCTOBER 1996, THROUGH FEBRUARY 1997

Commissioner Cascos moved that the monthly reports as required by the Local Government Section 114.026 for the months of October 1996, through February 1997, be acknowledged.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

The Reports are as follow:

(15) ACTION CONCERNING THE EARLY RELEASE OF COUNTY WARRANTS

At this time, Mr. Eddie A. Gonzalez, County Treasurer, stated that the State Comptroller's Office recommended that early Warrants should not be released prior to the Commissioners' Court approval.

Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, stated that early release of Warrants were necessary from time to time and explained that the process of said Warrants were submitted to the individual Members of the Court for three (3) or more signatures, in order for early release.

The suggestion was made that Warrants be released, subject to the Warrant being reviewed by the County Treasurer and the County Auditor, and the Commissioners' signing the early release warrants.

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, the early release of County Warrants was approved, subject to the County Treasurer's and the County Auditor's review.



(16) AUTHORIZATION OF THE PURCHASE WITHOUT THE PURCHASE ORDER, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$82.47, FROM DELUXE BUSINESS FORMS AND SUPPLIES

Commissioner Cascos moved that the Purchase without the Purchase Order, in the amount of \$82.47, from Deluxe Business Forms and Supplies, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.



(17) APPROVAL OF THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH CARTER AND BURGESS FOR THE PROPERTY ACQUISITION MAP ON THE LOS TOMATES BRIDGE AREA

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the Professional Services Contract with Carter and Burgess for the Property Acquisition Map on the Los Tomates Bridge Area was approved, subject to Legal review.

The Agreement is as follows:

(18) APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY PURPOSES OF 11.79 ACRES OUT OF THE F. J. COMBE TRACT, OUT OF TRACT NO. 9, OF SUBDIVISION AA@ PAREDES PARTITION, ESPIRITU SANTO GRANT

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, the Resolution was adopted authorizing condemnation for Right-of-Way purposes of 11.79 acres out of the F. J. Combe Tract, out of tract No. 9, of Subdivision AA@Paredes Partition, Espiritu Santo Grant.

The Resolution is as follows:

(19) APPROVAL OF THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH DOCUMENT NO. 7460004207 97, CHANGE NO. 08, ATTACHMENT NO. 09: AC DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION FOR THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1, 1997, THROUGH AUGUST 31, 1997, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,000.00

At this time, Mr. Mark Yates, County Auditor, stated that part of the Grant was for the City of Brownsville and requested the authorization to pay the City of Brownsville.

Commissioner Matz moved that the Texas Department of Health Document No. 7460004207 97, Change No. 08, Attachment No. 09: AC Disease Control and Prevention, be approved for the period of January 1, 1997, through August 31, 1997, in the amount of \$16,000.00, and the County Auditor was authorized to pay the City of Brownsville.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

The Document is as follows:

**(20) APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CAMERON COUNTY HEALTH
DEPARTMENT AND HELP AMERICA
CORPORATION (HELP) FOR THE PERIOD OF
ONE (1) YEAR**

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously, the Agreement between the Cameron County Health Department and Help America Corporation (HELP) for the period of one (1) year was approved.

The Agreement is as follows:

**(21) APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CAMERON COUNTY HEALTH
DEPARTMENT AND FINANCIAL
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL, INCORPORATED
(FIMED), FOR A PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR
COMMENCING MARCH 1997**

Commissioner Matz moved that the Agreement between the Cameron County Health Department and Financial International Medical, Incorporated (FIMED), be approved for a period of one (1) year commencing on March 1997.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

At this time, Commissioner Cascos expressed concern regarding the Agenda Request Items No. 20 and No. 21 not being initialed by the County Attorney or the County Auditor and requested that the initials be reflected on the packets, which were distributed to the Members of the Court.

The Agreement is as follows:

(22) APPOINTMENT OF THE PARK BOARD MEMBER TO FILL UNEXPIRED TERM OF VACATED SEAT

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, Ms. Penny Hartwell, Brownsville, Texas, was appointed as a Park Board Member to fill the unexpired term of a vacated seat.

(23) APPROVAL TO RENEW THE MOBILE VENDOR PERMIT NO. 11 - CHRISTY-S MOBILE UNIT NO. 1

Commissioner Matz moved that the Mobile Vendor Permit No. 11 - Christy-s Mobile Unit No. 1, be renewed.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

(24) AUTHORIZATION FOR THE ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR NEW VOTING EQUIPMENT

At this time, Judge Hinojosa recommended that only the Central Count System should be advertised.

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, the Elections Administrator was authorized to advertise for Request for Proposals for the Central Count System.

There was some discussion regarding whether there was enough time to advertise the Request for Proposals before the May Elections and the County Auditor explained that the Voting Machines could be leased from the existing vendors.

(25) APPROVAL FOR HARLINGEN SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL PARENT - TEACHER - STUDENT ASSOCIATION TO BORROW FOUR (4) VOTING MACHINES FOR A CAMPUS ELECTION TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1997

(26) APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR TO CONTRACT WITH THE BROWNSVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT TO CONDUCT THE SCHOOL BOARD OF TRUSTEE-S ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997

(27) APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR TO CONTRACT WITH THE CITY OF BROWNSVILLE TO CONDUCT THE MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1997

At this time, Judge Hinojosa stated that the entities should be notified of the new system of voting and added that there should not be two (2) different ways of voting within the County.

Ms. Amalia Cano, Elections Administrator, explained that some of the cities within the County were not large enough to implement the new system of voting and added that said cities had requested the lease of the voting machines.

Commissioner Benavides moved that the Harlingen South High School Parent - Teacher - Student Association be approved to borrow voting machines for a Campus Election to be held on Tuesday, March 25, 1997, and that the Elections Administrator be authorized to Contract with the Brownsville Independent School District to conduct the School Board of Trustees Election to be held on May 3, 1997, and the City of Brownsville, to conduct the Municipal Election, to be held on Saturday, May 3, 1997.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously.

The Contracts are as follow:

- (28) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE CITY OF LA FERIA ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (29) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE CITY OF PORT ISABEL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (30) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE CITY OF PRIMERA ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (31) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE CITY OF RIO HONDO ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (32) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (33) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE LA FERIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (34) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE LOS FRESNOS CONSOLIDATED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (35) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE POINT ISABEL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (36) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE SAN BENITO CONSOLIDATED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (37) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE SANTA ROSA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)
- (38) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE TOWN OF COMBES ELECTION TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)

**(39) IN THE MATTER OF THE VOTING MACHINE
LEASE AND SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR THE
TOWN OF SOUTH PADRE ISLAND ELECTION
TO BE HELD ON MAY 3, 1997 (TABLED)**

Upon motion by Commissioner Peña, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, these
Items were **TABLED**.



**(40) APPROVAL TO LEASE WAREHOUSE SPACE
FOR CONFISCATED VEHICLE(S) AT 2115
NORTH 77 SUNSHINE STRIP, HARLINGEN,
TEXAS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$587.50 PER
MONTH**

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the lease of
warehouse space for the confiscated vehicle(s) at 2115 North 77 Sunshine Strip, Harlingen, Texas, was approved, in
the amount of \$587.50 per month.

The Agreement is as follows:

(41) APPROVAL OF THE CONTRACT WITH GOMEZ-GARZA DESIGN, INCORPORATED, FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES FOR THE DESIGN AND PROJECT COORDINATION OF THE RENOVATION OF THE FOLLOWING CAMERON COUNTY PARKS: SANTA MARIA, SANTA ROSA, EL RANCHITO AND TO INCLUDE ALL BUILDING AND FACILITIES WITHIN

Commissioner Peña moved that the Contract with Gomez-Garza Design, Incorporated, be approved for Architectural Services for the Design and Project Coordination of the renovation of the following Cameron County Parks: Santa Maria, Santa Rosa and El Ranchito, including all building and facilities within the Parks, subject to Legal review.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides and carried unanimously.

The Contract is as follows:

(42) APPROVAL OF THE MANDATORY PRE-BID CONFERENCE FOR THE LOS TOMATES INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Mandatory Pre-Bid Conference for the Los Tomates International Bridge Construction Project was approved.

(43) AUTHORIZATION TO AWARD BIDS/REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR ASBESTOS REMOVAL - COUNTY BUILDING

Commissioner Benavides moved that the Bids/Request for Proposals be awarded to R. L. Abatement, Weslaco, Texas, in the amount of \$19,987.00.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously.

(44) APPROVAL OF CHANGE ORDER NO. 2 TO THE LOS TOMATES LEVEE RELOCATION CONTRACT

Upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Peña and carried unanimously, the Change Order No. 2 to the Los Tomates Levee Relocation Contract was approved.

The Order is as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

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

Upon motion by Commissioner Matz, seconded by Commissioner Cascos and carried unanimously, the

AConsent® Agenda Items were approved as follow:

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

- a) Administrative Assistant to County Judge to attend the ALegislative Session® in Austin, Texas, on March 11-12, 1997;
- b) Three (3) Health Department employees to attend the AAdult Immunization Strategies that Work Conference® in Harlingen, Texas, on April 24, 1997;
- c) Health Administrator to attend the AScientific and Community Forum on Neural Tube Defects in South Texas Conference® in Brownsville, Texas, on April 8-9, 1997;
- d) Health Administrator to serve as a member of the Steering Committee for the Children-s Health Transition Project® in Austin, Texas, on April 14, 1997;
- e) Health Department employee to assist with the Emergency Management of the Laredo Clinic in Laredo, Texas, on April 1-2, 1997;
- f) Health Department employee to continue to assist with the Emergency Management of the Laredo Clinic in Laredo, Texas, on April 8-9, 1997;
- g) Cameron Park Director to attend a luncheon given by the Texas A & M University College of Architecture, Center for Housing and Urban Development in Sebastian, Texas, on March 21, 1997;
- h) Family and Consumer Extension Agent to participate in the ADistrict 12-1997 4-H Fashion Show® in Laredo, Texas, on April 4, 1997;
- I) Engineering Department Building Inspectors and Building Official to meet with the City of Edinburg Fire Marshall in Edinburg, Texas, on March 18, 1997; and
- j) Program Development and Management Director and Community Development Coordinator to meet with Officials of the Texas Department of Housing and Community Development and Texas Department of Commerce in Austin, Texas, on March 27, 1997.

**(46) AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION OF THE LOS TOMATES INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE**



(47) PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

a) Precinct No. 3

South Padre Island Golf Community Phase I and II, being 87.082 acres of land, more or less out of Laguna Vista Subdivision of the Santa Isabel Grant, Cameron County; and

b) Precinct No. 4

Luz de Cielo Subdivision, Section No. 3, Phase I and II, being 30.784 acres of land out of the 45.40 acre tract, being out of the East half of Private Survey No. 424.

(48) FINAL APPROVAL

a) Precinct No. 1

El Naranjal Section No. 1 Subdivision, being a 76.828 acre tract consisting of all of Lots Nos. 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19, 5.00 acres of Lot No. 5, of Block No. 407, as shown on the Map of El Jardin Re-Subdivision as recorded in Volume 4, Page 48.

(49) PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL

a) Precinct No. 1

Herman and Cora Loop Estates Subdivision, 1.13 acre tract out of the North 30.55 acres in Block No. 40, of El Jardin Subdivision;

b) Precinct No. 4

Jose Farias Subdivision being a 3.765 acre, more or less tract of land out of original tracts of 15.31 acres of 20.00 acres, all out of Lots No. 1 and No. 2, Block No. 1, Subdivision Number One, Landrum Reserve; and

c) Precinct No. 2

Vermillion Estates Mobile Home Subdivision, a replat, being 22.704 acres, consisting of the North one half of Lot No. 1, Block No. 209, El Jardin Subdivision.

There being no further business to come before the Court, upon motion by Commissioner Benavides, seconded by Commissioner Matz and carried unanimously, the meeting was **ADJOURNED**.

APPROVED this **29th** day of **April, 1997**.

GILBERTO HINOJOSA
COUNTY JUDGE

ATTEST:

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