

STATE OF TEXAS

COMMISSIONERS' COURT  
MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 10, 2014

COUNTY OF COLLIN

On Monday, February 10, 2014, the Commissioners' Court of Collin County, Texas, met in Regular Session in the Commissioners' Courtroom, Jack Hatchell Collin County Administration Building, 4th Floor, 2300 Bloomdale Road, City of McKinney, Texas, with the following members present, and participating, to wit:

Judge Keith Self  
Commissioner Mark Reid, Precinct 1  
Commissioner Cheryl Williams, Precinct 2  
Commissioner Chris Hill, Precinct 3  
Commissioner Duncan Webb, Precinct 4

Judge Self led the Invocation.  
Commissioner Reid led the Pledge of Allegiance.  
Commissioner Williams led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Texas Flag.

1. Judge Self called to order the meeting of the Collin County Commissioners' Court at 1:30 p.m. Judge Self recessed the meeting at 2:00 p.m. and called to order the Commissioners' Court Workshop. Commissioners' Court Workshop was adjourned at 3:06 p.m. and the meeting of the Commissioners' Court was reconvened.

2. President Self called to order the meeting of the Collin County Health Care Foundation at 3:06 p.m. and adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

**DECISIONS MANDATED BY LEGAL ENTITIES OUTSIDE OF COMMISSIONERS COURT AUTHORITY:**

1. AI-37927 Donation of \$6,500 to the Children's Advocacy Center of Collin County (CACCC) utilizing the District Attorney Forfeiture Fund and budget amendment for same, District Attorney.

**FYI NOTIFICATION**

1. AI-34688 Outstanding Agenda items, Commissioners Court.

2. Public Comments.

### **3. Presentation/Recognition:**

#### **a. Service Pins, Human Resources.**

Jeff May, Auditor, presented Janna Benson-Caponera, Grant Accounting and Payroll Manager, with a service pin in recognition of 10 years of service. (Time: 1:32 p.m.)

**4. Consent agenda to approve:** Judge Self asked for comments on the consent agenda. Commissioner Hill pulled items 4c1, 4d1 and 4d2 for discussion. Commissioner Webb pulled item 4f2 and Judge Self pulled item 4e1. There being no further comments, a motion was made to approve the remainder of the consent agenda. (Time: 1:33 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Mark Reid  
Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams  
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

#### **a. AI-37922 Disbursements for the period ending February 4, 2014, Auditor.**

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-079-02-10**

#### **b. AI-37915 Tax refunds totaling \$1,005,377.79, Tax Assessor Collector.**

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-080-02-10**

#### **c. Agreement(s):**

**1. AI-37890 Engineering Services Agreement with Halff Associates, Inc. for the future extension of Park Blvd from FM 2514 east to SH 78 in Wylie, budget amendment in the amount of \$858,600 for same and further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, Special Projects.**

Commissioner Hill asked where the funds for the original project originated. Tracy Homfeld, Engineering, stated the funds were from the 2003 discretionary bond project funds for the County and from savings from past county managed projects. Judge Self questioned the hours set for the Principal of the project. Ruben Delgado, Engineering, explained 12 hours is a reasonable amount for the Principal. The Principal generally has fewer hours than other project members. He looks at the scope of the project, monitors progress, reviews invoices and makes sure the contract is moving smoothly.

Commissioner Reid asked Mr. Delgado how many bids were made on the project. Mr. Delgado stated this was a Request for Proposal (RFP) and there were eight proposals submitted. Three or four were interviewed by the team and Halff Associates came out on top. Mr. Delgado was asked what is the likelihood the Core of Engineers will waive the EA (Environmental Assessment) requirement which will drop phase two costs by 50%. If the County goes through the process outlined in phase one, that minimizes impact with the alignment of two existing roads. Mr. Delgado felt the likelihood is good for the 50% drop in phase two costs. With no further discussion, a motion was made to approve the item. (Time: 1:37 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams

Second by: Commissioner Chris Hill

Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-081-02-10**

**d. Amendment(s):**

1. **AI-37885** No. 6 to the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Anna for Animal Control Services to set the rate and extend the agreement for one (1) year through and including September 30, 2014. Payment will be made in quarterly installments for an annual amount of \$31,073, further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, Development Services.

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-082-02-10**

2. **AI-37884** No. 7 to Interlocal Agreement with the City of Anna for Facility Construction and use of the Animal Shelter to set the rate for FY2014, payments to be made in quarterly installments for an annual amount of \$25,090 effective October 1, 2013 through and including September 30, 2014 and further authorize the Purchasing Agent to finalize and execute same, Development Services.

Commissioner Hill pulled items 4d1 and 4d2 to ask Animal Services why the agreements are being discussed at this time and not with the earlier contracts. Bill Bilyeu, County Administrator, came forward to respond. Mr. Bilyeu explained there is an annual renewal after the initial period; the items are not put on the Court's agenda until the City finalizes their side of the agreements. The County has continued with the services because it was known the City would continue with the contracts. There has been no gap in service provided. A motion was made to approve items 4d1 and 4d2. (Time: 1:38 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Chris Hill

Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams

Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-083-02-10**

**e. Budget adjustment(s)/amendment(s):**

1. **AI-37916** \$2,840 for travel and training fees for the Tyler Technology Conference for JP1, JP3-1 and JP4, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 1.

Judge Self pulled this item for discussion. Hearing no comments, a motion was made to approve the item. (Time: 1:38 p.m.)

Motion by: Judge Keith Self  
Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams  
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-084-02-10**

**f. Miscellaneous**

1. **AI-37868** FY2015 Budget process, Budget.

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-085-02-10**

2. **AI-37928** Re-designation of private Road 5605 to Dovie Lane Trl. (with associated address updates), GIS/Rural Addressing.

Commissioner Webb pulled this item to gain clarification of the correct address for the barn located on Dovie Lane Trail. Caren Skipworth, Information Technology, clarified the correct address for the barn is 2890 Dovie Lane Trail and the address for the residence is 2855 Dovie Lane Trail. With that clarification, a motion was made to approve the item. (Time: 1:40 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Duncan Webb  
Second by: Commissioner Chris Hill  
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-086-02-10**

3. **AI-37930** Personnel Appointments, Human Resources.

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-087-02-10**

4. **AI-37931** Personnel Changes, Human Resources

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-088-02-10**

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

5. **AI-37919** 2014 Mobility Plan update presented by Jacobs Engineering, Engineering.

Mr. Delgado came forward to introduce Mike McAnelly and Clarence Daugherty of Jacobs Engineering to present a briefing on the Collin County Mobility Plan. The briefing is a precursor to the community meeting that will take place on February 18, 2014, to adopt the Collin County Mobility Plan.

Mr. McAnelly gave a status report to bring the Court up to date on the Mobility Plan. The Mobility Plan is entering the final stages of development. The Planning Board has been working on this since June of 2012. The target for completion was December of 2013 but was extended to March of 2014 for additional time needed to obtain the travel demand model from NCTCOG (North Central Texas Council of Governments). Multiple meetings were held with 15 out of 23 individual cities to obtain their input to incorporate into the draft of the Mobility Plan. The Planning Board will be briefed in greater detail on February 13, 2014, and a final community meeting will be held February 18, 2014. The final draft of the Mobility Plan is expected to be brought to the Court for review and adoption with a final public hearing held in March 2014.

Mr. McAnelly shared the current draft of the thoroughfare portion of the Mobility Plan with the Court. This draft is the most detailed plan to date with over 100 refinements and changes based on the analysis of the NCTCOG model and input received from the cities. The map represents an ultimate implementation timeframe model. Modeling has produced not only a long range forecast for 2035 but also a new financially constrained element looking at affordable projects based on available funding to be implemented by 2020. It is believed that it will be a strong plan to meet the County's requirements.

Commissioner Hill requested that Mr. McAnelly change the colors on the map for tollways and principal six-lane divided roads to more distinguishable colors. The current colors could lead to confusion for citizens looking at the map because the two colors look similar.

The final community meeting will be held on February 18, 2014, in the Conference Center of Collin County Community College, Central Park Campus in McKinney from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Meeting objectives include: sharing the draft Mobility Plan update, provide opportunities for questions and discussion about recommendations and obtain feedback from participants. There will be an open house from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. for participants to sign in and visit stations that will be set up to view maps and exhibits with information about the drafted Mobility Plan. The presentation and work session will begin at 7:00 p.m. and run until 8:30 p.m. After the presentation and question and comment session, keypad polling will take place to gain a real-time sense of the participant's response to the recommendations.

Emails and flyers have been sent out to cities, other agencies, past meeting participants and to the Collin County media list. The information is also on the Mobility Plan's page of the Collin County website. Mr. McAnelly asked the Court to assist the Planning Board by forwarding an email to contacts, constituents, and colleagues to encourage participation in the meeting.

Commissioner Webb referred to the map and asked about the transit line that is labeled for future study on the west border of the County. Mr. McAnelly stated the line is BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway) that goes to Frisco then on up to Celina. The line has been identified as a future rail transit corridor. Mr. Daugherty commented that BNSF owns the right-of-way and this is a good example of looking into the future. The draft is the final build out and the projected population is 2.09 million. There have been other studies by demographers that put the population at a midpoint of 2.8 million by 2050, but the Board could not justify the higher number with their projections.

Commissioner Webb asked for clarification on the difference between the terms "principal" and "major" for six-lane divided roads. Mr. Daugherty explained that both are six lanes and accomplish the same goal. The principal roads increase capacity slightly by radius on corners, the treatment of turn lanes and rights-of-way. Commissioner Williams asked if the expansion and warehouse project by KCS (Kansas City Southern Railroad) in Wylie was taken under consideration. Mr. Daugherty stated the full development of the Wylie project has been taken into account as well as the traffic demand and is accurate. There will be a note in the Plan to look at future studies for improvement of highways including Highways 380 and 78. (Time: 2:00 p.m.)

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

**6. AI-37960 Board/Committee Appointments, Commissioners Court:**

**a. Planning Board.**

Commissioner Reid appointed Bracy Wilson to the Planning Board. A motion was made to approve the appointment.

Motion by: Commissioner Mark Reid

Second by: Commissioner Chris Hill

Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-089-02-10**

**7. AI-35285 Medicaid 1115 Waiver, Regional Health Partnership, Administrative Services.**

Mr. Bilyeu came forward to give a brief update. All reporting entities are meeting requirements. One entity is slightly behind with transaction counts needed; therefore, their payment will be reduced, but the entity is meeting guidelines on submissions. Discussions have taken place with them to get reporting on track. The Court approved software for tracking and submission to the State has been delivered and is operational. (Time: 1:42 p.m.)

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

8. Possible future agenda items by Commissioners Court without discussion.

Judge Self recessed the meeting of the Commissioners' Court at 2:00 p.m. and called to order the Commissioners' Court Workshop.

### **COMMISSIONERS' COURT WORKSHOP**

1. **AI-37920** Transportation Development Credits (TDCs) Program presentation, Engineering.

Tracy Homfeld, Engineering, came forward to give a presentation on the TDCs Program and stated that members of NCTCOG (North Central Texas Council of Governments) will be addressing the Court in March 2014. At that time NCTCOG will give more details on the program and have a list of projects that have current allocation of federal funding. This will give the Court a better idea of projects in Collin County that will be eligible for the TDCs.

TDCs were approved by the Federal Highway Administration as a tool to help fund projects that already have allocations of federal funds. TDCs are earned by the region when toll revenues are used to fund capital projects on public highways. Currently the Dallas-Fort Worth MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) has 465 million credits available. TDCs are not money or cash; they are credits and do not increase the funding for a given project. Projects are eligible for a match to federal funding awarded with an 80% to 20% split. Federal funding would account for 80% of the project and the local agency would account for 20%. Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) receives 25% of TDCs across the state and the remaining 75% of TDCs are allocated to MPOs. The TDC award process includes: (1) an application by the local entity; (2) evaluation of applications; (3) public involvement; (4) award of TDCs; and (5) add project with TDCs to TIP/STIP (Transportation Improvement Program/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program). Highway, transit and bicycle or pedestrian projects are the eligible projects to receive TDCs. Credits will not be split according to the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and/or Surface Transportation Program–Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM) Eastern and Western Funding Distributions.

Approximately 200 million credits have been divided into five categories leaving 250 million credits for future use. Five million credits have been put into Category 1 for strategic awards to small transit providers. The goal is to support public transit by maximizing the use of federal funds. Eligible projects would be buses, mobility management, maintenance or planning with an open call for these funds.

Category 2 has a proposed amount of 1-2 million credits for a Type 1 Call, where the RTC (Regional Transportation Council) has the revenue and uses the revenue for projects based on the Transportation Alternative Programs. The RTC revenue is made up of formula funding. A call for projects will open February 24, 2014, and close April 28, 2014. The RTC will decide up front whether or not to include TDCs as an option in a funding initiative or call for projects. Safe routes to schools are the intended target for credits.

Category 3 is a Type 2 Call with 50 million credits that could increase next year. Under this Category local agencies are providing the revenue. The local agency has federal funding allocated to it and in lieu of providing the 20% local match they would apply for the credits. In turn the local agency could then sell the project to NCTCOG and use the 20% savings to fund other transportation projects. These are projects that are pre-let. Goals for this Category include: (1) advance projects of strategic importance; (2) support capacity expansion of roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects; (3) leverage projects to maximize revenue available to regional transportation projects; (4) expedite multi-modal project delivery; and (5) demonstrate innovative funding, partnering or project delivery methods. NCTCOG will be looking at their STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program) and tell the County which projects are on the books for the next several years that have federal funding already allocated.

Ms. Homfeld was asked to explain how TDCs are converted to actual dollars. The credits are not actual dollars. Projects that use TDCs will become fully funded by the federal government redeeming those credits. Part of the application process is for the local agency to show how they are going to be innovative with their 20% savings. That 20% savings has to be used to fund another transportation project in order to receive TDCs for the original project. The FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) has given the MPO the authority to approve projects. Therefore, the RTC does have to approve the new project where the 20% will be used. The redemption process is the same for Categories 1, 2 and 3. Once the project is approved, credits will be redeemed by the federal government dollar for dollar.

Ms. Homfeld continued explaining Category 3. There must be a case made for the proposed project. The local agency will need to explain the problem, demonstrate how the solution will address the problem, and provide performance measures. The local agency must consider how award of credits will expand funding for the transportation project. State and local matching funds replaced by TDCs must be reinvested in other transportation projects within the region. No additional federal funds will be identified to cover the gap created by the use of TDCs. The 20% must be made up of all local funds.



Category 4 is projected at 150 million TDCs. This is where MPOs have the ability to transfer or sell the allocated TDCs to other MPOs or TxDOT. The RTC approved staff to negotiate a transfer of credits contingent on RTC approval: 50 million to MPOs and 100 million to TxDOT. The goals of transferring or selling credits are to generate a local revolving fund to cash flow federal programs administered by NCTCOG and to generate local revenue for locally funded programs and projects to be awarded by the RTC. The anticipation is that the credits will be sold at a discount. Commissioner Webb explained that if the TDCs become sellable, the RTC will have great discussion on how to allocate the additional revenue. Judge Self commented that he would be speaking with the Dallas County Judge as the vast majority of the 465 million TDCs generated are by tollways in Collin County and Dallas County.

Category 5 is regional programs and management and operations with 10 million TDCs proposed. This is the review of existing projects that are NCTCOG implemented regional programs. This Category is to support regional programs that improve air quality, congestion and reliability. Examples are air quality education and outreach and safety education and data collection. NCTCOG staff will perform a strategic review of existing regional initiatives. Additional federal funds will not be added to offset the loss of local match. Streamlining and other cost saving opportunities will be reviewed to ensure the project can be completed without local matching funds. TDCs will be utilized on projects with a small budget resulting in high administrative cost to collect local match. This reduces RTC's reliance on dwindling sources of local matching funds for regional programs and makes savings available for future projects. If awarded TDCs by the RTC, awardee will execute an agreement with NCTCOG. The goal is to obligate the credits as quickly as possible as projects should be ready for implementation. If TDCs are not obligated in a timely fashion, the TDCs may be rescinded. Entities must request award from MPO first. If TDCs are not awarded by MPO, applicant can apply for TxDOT TDCs. The applicant will need to request a letter of support from the RTC for inclusion in the TxDOT application. At this point TxDOT has not issued a call for projects for those TDCs. (Time: 2:36 p.m.)

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

**2. AI-37933 Use of Discretionary Funds Policy, Engineering.**

Ms. Homfeld gave a presentation on the use of the Discretionary Funds Policy. Information was provided on the current sources of funding.

Discretionary Funding Source 1: to date, all new bond projects have been funded using savings from past County managed bond projects or city reallocated funds. None of the \$15 million from the 2007 discretionary dollars have been expended.

Discretionary Funding Source 2: available funding in the 2007 Bond Discretionary Account is approximately \$4 million. Currently this is all savings from past County managed projects. No funding requested for projects has been from City projects.

Discretionary Funding Source 3: this is eligible to be sold. In 2008, 2009 and 2010 there were different amounts that the County funded for projects where bonds were not sold. Funding was provided by fund balance or through savings from past county managed projects. In 2008, the Court funded \$16,303,788 worth of projects from savings from old county managed projects or fund balance. This was interest earned from bonds. In 2009, the Court funded \$9,656,500 worth of projects from old county managed projects that included funds swept to the discretionary account. In 2010, the Court funded \$3,110,000 worth of projects from old county managed projects that included funds swept to the discretionary account. The total of \$29,070,288 worth of projects in those three years was funded without selling bonds for those projects. Therefore, the County still has the authorization to sell another \$29 million to potentially be added to the amount available to allocate. This amount does not include the \$500,000 allocated to the Lake Lavon Bridge Study. The total available in the discretionary fund is \$48,133,254 which consists of \$15,000,000 from the 2007 bond program, \$4,062,966 from savings of past projects and \$29,070,288 from projects where bonds were not sold.

After funding sources were discussed Ms. Homfeld presented allocation options. Allocation Option 1 is where projects are evaluated case by case based on merit and criteria by the entire Court. A few criteria points include: does the city have their 50% match, is the project on the County Mobility Plan, is the county road or bridge submitted in need of an upgrade for safety reasons, does the project bring a benefit to the County through congestion mitigation, air quality benefits or economic benefits. Savings on city discretionary projects would go back to the discretionary account for future allocation. Engineering is asking that an allocation, made with discretionary funds or for a particular project, only be used for said project. If a funded project has any savings, those savings should go back to the discretionary account and the city would have to reapply to fund a new project. Based on Option 1 each project is looked at individually and will not be automatically eliminated. The County Engineering Department maintains the ability to ask for funding for county road or bridge projects or other TxDOT on-system beneficial projects as the need arises. The Court acts as a whole when reviewing projects and will possibly review each city's top priority projects as submitted. The bulk of the funding allocations could end up in one or more precincts. This does not allow for programming of funds; however, reviewing the funding per city can be one of the criteria each time a project is submitted. The Court can look at how much a jurisdiction has received in the past.

Commissioner Webb asked if there is any concern about allocations made in the first half of the year being called for rights-of-way in the last half of the year and funds not being available. Ms. Homfeld stated Engineering is working with TxDOT to get figures on how much TxDOT will be requesting as far as rights-of-way and construction participation. They have supplied a list of funding amounts that will be needed in the next few years. Ruben Delgado, Engineering, came forward to explain when a project request comes to Engineering, the department looks at what funding is available, is the project reasonable and will the County be able to fund the project. Once those items are determined Engineering presents that information to the Court.

Commissioner Hill asked Ms. Homfeld if she has a recommendation for the Court as to what the Court should hold in contingency and what should not be programmed by any of the options. Ms. Homfeld stated the recommendation would be given to the Court before a vote takes place.

Allocation Option 2a is the equal allocation per precinct. Funding is divided four or five ways. If the project meets the criteria, the Court would only vote to approve the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) to encumber the funds. Each Commissioner and/or Judge will receive an allocation for their precinct. Engineering would keep track of each Commissioner's allocations as cities submit projects for ILA. The ILA would then be brought to the Court for approval. Funding will be equally distributed throughout the County giving each Court member the ability to program funds per precinct. This could limit county managed projects and the Court could possibly review each city's top priority projects. Worthwhile projects may go unfunded if the precinct is out of funds. Also, available funding may be insufficient for construction projects.

Allocation Option 2b is allocation by precinct based on the percentage of taxable income per city. Funding is divided among the Commissioner precincts based on a city's percentage of taxable income provided to the County. The Court again could review each city's top priority projects. The majority of funding would end up in one or more precincts. This could limit county managed projects or this could be used as evaluation criteria instead of an option.

Allocation Option 3 is allocating based on three funding categories with the amount to be determined by the Court. The first category would be funding for city managed projects to be allocated by one of the options previously mentioned. The second category would be funding for county managed projects to be allocated by Option 1. The third category is funding for city managed projects for cities that do not have their match. The third category is typically used by smaller cities and the match would be repaid to the County. Terms of the loan would be approved by the Court. Commissioner Webb asked in situations like the third category has the County previously funded a match without the expectation of repayment or did the County reduce bond allocations for those cities. Ms. Homfeld stated to her knowledge the County has always expected either a reduction in bond allocation or the payback of funds. County managed projects are not competing with city projects. Again reviewing of each city's top priority project is possible with this option. Funding will be made available for smaller cities looking to advance projects that could economically benefit the city. Also there will be a smaller amount of funds overall for cities to apply for.

Commissioner Hill commented that Option 3 requires a selection of one of the other Options to fit into the first category and adds the component of county managed projects and/or the contingency fund and the Collin County "bank" fund. Ms. Homfeld agreed, stating an Allocation Option is necessary with the three categories of Option 3 for the amount given to the cities.

Commissioner Hill referred back to Allocation Option 1 where it states programming of funds is not allowed. The Commissioner stated this assumes the Court will take on projects as they come in giving preference to cities that have their application submitted quicker or have their match in place. The Commissioner asked if it is possible to have an Allocation Option 1b that allows for more programming to give more time for cities to put forth their best project and the Court to approve the projects most beneficial to the County. Ms. Homfeld stated that there could be an Option 1b and a criterion could be to look at the project priority list. Cities will communicate to the County when each phase of their project is ready, when it will commence and when it will be completed, as well as how much money they hold in match. Ms. Homfeld will work with the cities on the matrix criteria, similar to the RTR (Regional Toll Revenues) list, and obtain their buy off on it. If the cities know ahead of time how much money the County is allocating, they will know how far down the priority list the County can go because the projects will be ranked. This can be introduced into any of the Option methods. The Court was in agreement that the ranking of projects is ideal for strategic planning and gives leadership to the process in approving the most beneficial projects for the County.

Judge Self requested Monika Arris, Budget, to provide the Court with an iChart for the \$29 million to show what it will do to the debt service. Commissioner Williams shared her concern of Allocation Option 1 with large amounts of money being allocated to one precinct over another. If there is buy in from the communities, it is more tolerable. Ms. Homfeld stated this too can be an Allocation Option. It can be strictly based off of the ranking spreadsheet with buy in from communities and Commissioners' Court along with the list of cities' top priority projects. There will be discussion with the communities before the ranking process begins and it is hoped to have a finished product to present the Court with all the communities in agreement. (Time: 3:06 p.m.)

Judge Self adjourned the Commissioners' Court Workshop and reconvened the meeting of the Commissioners' Court at 3:06 p.m. The meeting was recessed at 3:06 p.m. and President Self called to order the meeting of the Health Care Foundation.

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Judge Self reconvened the meeting of the Commissioners' Court at 3:15 p.m. and recessed the meeting into Executive Session in accordance with Paragraph 551.071 of the Local Government Code, Legal and Paragraph 551.087, Economic Development Negotiations. Judge Self reconvened the meeting at 3:42 p.m.

**Legal (551.071)**

**AI-37888** Consultation with an attorney regarding FCC caps on inmate long distance, Administrative Services.

A motion was made that Collin County intervene in the Securus v. FCC (Federal Communications Commission) lawsuit conditioned upon the County being fully indemnified and held harmless for all of its attorney's fees and expenses by Securus. The motion authorized the County attorney to prepare the appropriate documents and have them signed by Securus representatives prior to the intervention. (Time: 3:42 p.m.)

Motion by: Commissioner Duncan Webb  
Second by: Commissioner Cheryl Williams  
Vote: 5 – 0 Passed

**COURT ORDER NO. 2014-090-02-10**

**Economic Development Negotiations (551.087)**

**AI-37910** FedEx Office and Print Services Inc. Tax Abatement, Budget.

**NO ACTION TAKEN**

There being no further business of the Court, Judge Self adjourned the meeting of the Commissioners' Court at 3:42 p.m.



*Keith Self*

Keith Self, County Judge

*Mark Reid*

Mark Reid, Commissioner, Pct. 1

*Cheryl Williams*

Cheryl Williams, Commissioner, Pct. 2

Not Present

Chris Hill, Commissioner, Pct. 3

*Duncan Webb*

Duncan Webb, Commissioner, Pct. 4

ATTEST:

*Stacey Kemp*

Stacey Kemp, Ex-Officio Clerk  
Commissioners Court  
Collin County, T E X A S