

STATE OF TEXAS

(Minutes conducted via electronic voting)

COUNTY OF CAMERON

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the **9th day of December, 2025**, the Board of Trustees of the Brownsville Independent School District met in a **Special Called Board Meeting** at the Administration Building, 1900 Price Road, Brownsville, Texas, for the purpose of transacting any and all business that came before the Board and with the following to wit:

PRESENT:

Daniella Lopez Valdez	President
Frank Ortiz	Vice-President
Minerva Pena	Secretary
Carlos Elizondo	Board Member (arrived at 5:42 p.m.)
Denise Garza	Member
Jessica Gonzalez	Member
Neida Ruth Grantland	Member

ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT:

Dr. Jesus H. Chavez	Superintendent of Schools
---------------------	---------------------------

ALSO ABSENT:

None

WHEREUPON, a quorum being present and it appearing before the Board, it is hereby so found that notice of this **Special Called Board Meeting** has been duly given in the manner and for the length of time as prescribed by law. The meeting was called to order and declared ready for the transaction of business with the following to wit:

- I. Special Called Board Meeting called to order by Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President at 5:30 p.m.**
- II. Moment of Silence led by Dr. Jesus H. Chavez, Superintendent.**
- III. Pledge of Allegiance led by Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President.**
- IV. Roll Call. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President announced that all Trustees were present**
- V. Recommend approving the agenda of the Special Called Board Meeting of Tuesday, December 9, 2025, with any corrections/deletions.**

Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, I would like to motion to Change the Order of the Day VII. After V, and VIII. A. 1 after Public Comment. Jessica Gonzalez, Board Member stated second.

Dr. Jesus H. Chavez stated the following correction: Amendment: Item VI. A, Agenda item should read RFQ #26-131

Motion made by Daniella Lopez Valdez. Seconded by Jessica Gonzalez, and unanimously carried to recommend approval to Change the Order of the Day to VII after V, and VIII A 1 after Public Comment as stated by Daniella Lopez Valdez, and item VI. A, agenda item should read RFQ #26-131, as stated by Dr. Jesus H. Chavez, Superintendent. (6-0-0)

CHANGE ORDER OF THE DAY

Move VII. Public Comment after agenda item V

Move VIII. A. 1 after Public Comment

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Veronica Borrego Good evening board president, Mrs. Lopez Valdez, esteemed Board Members, Superintendent, Dr. Chavez, and all watching this evening here in the boardroom and at home. My name is Veronica Borrego and I have been with BISD for 20 years and I'm currently serving the district as an Educational Diagnostician. I am also the proud president of AOB, the Association of Brownsville Educators, the largest and longest serving association in BISD. This evening, I am here to discuss the retention stipend. Texas teachers' salaries have historically lagged behind the national average. Inflation is at an all-time high, and many BISD employees have taken on additional jobs to earn supplemental pay or work outside of school hours to cover basic expenses. This additional load, along with the extra hours and work educators do on their own time without compensation, can lead to burnout and educators leaving the profession. Educators often spend out of their own pocket to buy classroom supplies and decorations. And during the holidays, they often use their own money to buy gifts for their students. As per the agenda, the board will be discussing a \$750 retention stipend. We urge the board to consider raising the stipend to \$1,500. A retention stipend can help offset the previously mentioned personal investments, but during the holiday season, the stipend can be a meaningful way for BISD to show it values and appreciates all the employees for their hard work and for making our district shine. This stipend will not only help boost morale, but also bring some financial relief during what can be a financially challenging time of year for many. Please take this into consideration as you discuss the stipend. On behalf of AOB, I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to each and every BISD employee for your dedication and hard work. I wish you all a safe, restful, and joyful holiday season. Thank you for your time and attention, and may you have a wonderful evening.

Lazaro Cardenas All right, good evening members of the Board, Board President López Valdés, Superintendent Chávez. My name is Lázaro Cárdenas. I am a proud member of AOB, the largest and longest serving union in our district. Tonight, I want to talk about the cost of living adjustments and inflation.

Jessica Gonzalez stepped out at 5:42 p.m.

As we consider a one-time retention stipend for teachers and staff, it is essential to acknowledge the impact of inflation on purchasing power. From 2023 to 2024, the average inflation rate was 2.89 % with a cumulative price increase of 2.89%. This means that the cost of living has risen and our educator salaries haven't kept pace with inflation. And for example, we have food and beverages have gone up by 2.24%. Housing has gone up by 4.37 % increase. This is from 23

to 24. Transportation, 1.39 % increase. Medical care, 2.69%, sorry, from 24 to 25.

Mr. Carlos Elizondo arrived at 5:42 p.m.

Here are some examples. On average, a teacher's healthcare premium has increased by \$100 a year. The groceries have increased by 10%, adding \$50 to weekly expenses. And rent increases have increased 5%, adding around \$500 to monthly housing costs. To maintain their standard of living, teachers and staff need a cost of living adjustment. A one-time retention stipend can help offset the effects of inflation and demonstrate our appreciation their hard work. The consequences of not having a cost of living adjustment as stated by TEA.

Jessica Gonzalez returned at 5:43 p.m.

15 % of teachers left the profession from 22 to 23 and that trend has continued, citing unsustainable living costs and lack of compensation. This is according to TEA. BISD is not immune to this trend with many teachers struggling to afford basic necessities. We urge the Board to consider a one-time retention stipend of \$1,500 to help offset the increased cost of medical care, housing, and other essentials. This stipend would help retain experienced teachers and reduce turnover costs, demonstrate the district's commitment to supporting educators' well-being, and alleviate some of the financial stress caused by inflation. We believe this stipend is a necessary investment in our educators and the future of BISD students. We're eager to work together to find a solution that supports our teachers and benefits our community. Thank you and have a good evening

Celia Saiz Broussard Good evening President Lopez -Valdez, Dr. Chavez, and members of the Board. My name is Celia Saiz and I'm speaking as the president of BEST/AFT, Union Local 3877, as a proud Pre-K Teacher at Skinner Elementary as well. BEST/AFT wish all of you, our fellow BISD colleagues, and the Brownsville community season's greetings. BEST is always appreciative when the district can provide all employees with an additional stipend. We are acutely aware that many of our professional colleagues who are not teachers did not receive a raise this year and that our classified workers received very little. They should be the focus of the stipend no matter what the amount may be. Our concern is the increase in the budget deficit that the district currently has, as we would like an assurance that if this stipend is given, we won't have layoffs or a reduction in force later this year. If the district cannot guarantee that, then as much as we would like to have some extra money at Christmas, we would rather have our jobs at the end of the year. Thank you for your attention. The Best Union wishes you the best of evenings. Thank you.

Patrick Hammes Good evening, Board President Lopez -Valdez, Dr. Chavez, members of the Board, and our Brownsville community. Patrick Hammes on the behalf of BEST/AFT. I'm speaking on agenda item VIIA1. I would like to follow up on President Broussard's comments. We would like our fellow district employees in the Brownsville community to know that the one duty, the one responsibility of the school Board is the budget. You cannot blame this on the Superintendent or on Administration. This is your responsibility. I agree with my president's words that, yes, we would like to have a stipend as long as there is a guarantee from the board and the administration that there will not be any reduction in force at the end of the school year. It is our understanding that the district currently has a \$15 million deficit in the budget. It is our understanding that if you pass the \$750 stipend, you will add \$6.6 million to the deficit, bringing it up to \$21.6 million. Where are you going to make this deficit up? The stipend is called a retention stipend, but with the budget deficit and lower enrollment, shouldn't it be a retention stipend? a resignation incentive in lieu of a retention stipend? The district could also consider a perfect attendance incentive, as well as Fresno's, Harlingen, and San Benito school districts

have in their districts. A lot of our members have reached out and they are asking, how are we able to give the money when we've been talking about the deficit all year? We know that there's conversations about school closings that will be coming up after the new year. Members have told our organization, and I believe leaders of other organizations, that they would rather keep their school open, and if that means giving up their stipend, so be it. And then again, to echo what Celia said, your counselors, librarians, diagnosticians, fellow professionals, assistant principals, who are not our members, none of them got a raise this year. Some of your classified employees only got a nickel or 10 cents an hour, depending upon their step. So again, I don't know legally if you can split this up to those who deserve it the most, but I think that your responsibility your fiduciary responsibility to the community and to your employees is be smart with what you have. We'd rather have our job than a small check at Christmas. Thank you.

Nancy Beltran Good evening Madam President, Daniela Lopez Valdez, Superintendent Dr. Chavez, members of the Board, the audience here present and those watching us. My name is Nancy Beltran, president of Texas Valley Educators Association. I am here tonight to thank those who have stood by our BISD teachers and staff recommending the retention stipend. As you know, these past couple of months have not been easy for our employees. Everything is expensive. from the food that we put on the table for our families to the gas that we put to get to work every day. But I am glad that you have taken the initiative to help, especially during the holidays. I can personally say that this money is going to be able to put food on my table this Christmas. And we'll bring my kids one gift at least for Christmas. Please know that I am aware that BISD does everything possible for its employees. And it saddens me to know that things have gotten so bad that it has come to having a retention stipend to be able to get through Christmas. I'm sorry. And it saddens me to know that this stipend is just going to be enough to get my family through Christmas. This retention stipend is not something extra that is just going to go to buying presents. It's actually going to go to my necessities for my household and many of our employees' households. Thank you for your recommendation and I pray that each of you opens your hearts and your minds to greater need for everybody that works for BISD. May your vote be unanimous. passing this retention stipend to allow our BISD employees the knowledge of our BISD board, being aware to the hard work we do and the dedication we have to our students and to the entire Brownsville community. I thank you for allowing me to speak. Have the merriest of Christmases and the most happiest of New Years and may God bless you. And as we always say at TVEA, get to know us before you need us. Thank you.

VIII. Superintendent's Report:

A. General Function Item(s):

1. Recommend approval of Resolution #025/25-26 for a Retention Stipend to be paid on or after December 19, 2025 to all full-time and permanent part-time employees who were employed as of July 1, 2025 or 1st day of the 25-26 working calendar and who remain employed in the same capacity on December 19, 2025 and substitute teachers who worked 71 days or more during the period of August 11, 2025 through November 21, 2025 in the amount of \$750.00.

Ms. Minerva Pena, Board Member stated, question? I would like to... Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, I believe Ms. Grantland had her hand first. Ms. Neida Ruth Grantland, Board Member stated, thank you, Madam President. It's my understanding that this conversation about this particular item was a part of the budget process when you all

were deciding on what needed to be budgeted for as you do every year. I was not here at the time, but I do understand that this was something that the Board discussed and was hoping to possibly do. So it brings me pleasure that this is on the agenda, however, I do have some thoughts that I'd like for us to consider. First of all, I think that every person who works in this district is valuable. No matter what the job is, no matter what the hours are, I think every job is valued to our students. I also believe that this season is a very difficult season, as evidenced by some of the comments made, and it really touches my heart that we're in a situation that's like this. We're not the only district, there is districts all across the state that are like this. In the effort to look at this proposal in a way that is supportive as well as recognizing the fact that we are in a deficit, and we do have to make some tough choices. This choice is not tough from the humane perspective. This choice is tough from the fiscal perspective. And so we, I think, need to handle it with great care. I was very thankful that our TIA teachers got such great amounts when at the beginning of the year that they qualified for that. It made me very sad to see that our counselors, nurses, assistant principals, principals, and many other people, nurses, whoever, many other people didn't fit that category that the state in its wisdom set up. Having been an assistant principal, having been a principal, I know the work that's involved. And I know that it was kind of a slap in the face, but it was not a slap that we issued. It was one that came down from the state. I also know that we have some very unrepresented people in our district when it comes to something like this. And I agree that our classified staff throughout the district very unrepresented when it comes to the money that's handed out. I also agree that because these people didn't qualify for TIA, it was not a fair thing in my mind as far as the state was concerned in their decision. So in the spirit of looking at this from all angles and trying to be supportive of it, I would like to amend the motion, please, if that is allowed. And I gave long. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, you can amend. OK. Ms. Grantland continued, I gave long thought to what I would like to amend it to. So I would like to amend the motion to recalibrate the amounts given by placing emphasis on a tier one, which is \$750 to all professionals who did not qualify for the TIA. That means any classroom teachers, any nurses, assistant principals, those people who didn't come under the TIA umbrella. to have a \$750 incentive for them. I also would like to for the amendment to have a tier 2 which is \$750 to classified employees across the district and a tier 3 which I believe we were looking at the substitutes to pay substitutes who worked 30 days or more across the district as well. And so that amount, not \$750 to Tier 3, but that amount would be determined by what is left at the end of Tier 1 and 2 allocations, and then that would be divided among that population of the substitutes. And so this is my amendment. Ms. Pena stated, may I make an amendment? Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, we have a motion on the table? Ms. Pena stated, okay. Ms. Lopez Valdez continued, we need a second for this and then we'll vote and then we can get to the next there. Mr. Carlos Elizondo, Board Member stated, I have a question. Ms. Lopez Valdez interjected, on the motion, Mr. Elizondo? Mr. Elizondo replied, correct. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated yes. Mr. Elizondo continued, just real quick, did you think of how much the cost would be? Ms. Grantland replied, well, I understand that it's 6.6 million I think is what was mentioned here. I do not know the exact amount of the cost but whether it is or not, this was proposing 750 to all the people and I am proposing 750 to two categories of people and then the rest to be determined for the substitute category. Mr. Elizondo stated, okay, so what you're saying is as long as it doesn't go over? Ms. Grantland replied, correct. Mr. Elizondo stated, okay. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, I'm willing to second the item. Ms. Pena stated, okay, I have a question on her amendment. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, you have an amendment question Ms. Pena? Ms. Pena continued, yes, so you're

saying that the substitutes will not get the 750. Whatever's left over, if you're lucky, maybe you'll get something. You're saying the substitutes are not as valuable that day when they come in because our teacher's going. Ms. Grantland interjected, don't put words in my mouth. I'm not saying they're not valuable. Ms. Pena continued, I'm interpreting that because I'm hearing you say that whatever's left over, and to me, that's heartbreaking. But is that what you're saying? What if it's leftover? Ms. Grantland replied, well, no. What I'm saying is after you look at Tier 1 and Tier 2 who are our full-time employees, then yes, there will be an amount left not to exceed the amount allocated at the budget process. And that will be divided among the substitutes. And in no way am I saying they're not valuable. As a principal, I know how valuable substitutes can be. Ms. Pena stated, but they're going to get a lot less. Ms. Grantland stated, well, they'll get less than \$750, I don't know how much less. It depends on the amount. Ms. Pena stated, okay. I just have an issue with that because to me I value all of them the same because they're serving our same children. Ms. Grantland stated, well, I value people all the same, but I also, as a fiscal person, with that responsibility, value the idea that we have to be smart about what we do. Mr. Frank Ortiz, Board Member stated, I'm certainly always going to advocate for employees. I've always done that, and I will continue to do that. The way that I see the item agenda written here, it says for all full-time and part-time employees. To me, that means everyone that's employed, full-time from July 1st through December the 19th, and all these part-time employees as well. The only people that I see that we're leaving out would be the new hires that usually don't come on board until around September or so because of their contracts. A lot of them get hired in August, and sometimes they don't get approved until September. So those are the ones that I see that are being left out, and I think that we shouldn't leave them out. The other question that I have are on the substitute teachers. They need to substitute for 71 days from the period beginning August 11th through November the 21st. If you count those instructional days, that's about 85 days, but then you subtract the holidays in between and so forth. And I guess a question to Dr. Gallegos here is how many substitutes do we have, Dr. Gallegos, right now, more or less? **Dr. Linda Gallegos, Chief Human Resource Officer replied, we have approximately 800, a little more than 800 substitutes.** Mr. Ortiz stated, okay, so out of the 800, I'm sure that you have the numbers by now since y'all are looking at this for stipends. Between the time frame from August the 11th to November the 21st, how many of those substitutes have actually worked 71 days? **Dr. Gallegos replied, five.** Mr. Ortiz continued, that's what I thought, so I think we need to take a look at that. Instead of 71 days, if we're going to amend it, Ms. Grantland, maybe we should can take a look at that number. Ms. Grantland interjected, I would agree. Mr. Ortiz continued, due to the fact that we're, I mean, out of 800, only 5? That sounds about right. I mean, it's not realistic that those are working every single day. So, you know, we do value our substitute teachers as well because, you know, they are, a lot of them are professionals. So maybe we can take a look at that number instead of 71, lower that number a little bit more. Ms. Grantland stated, I would agree to include that as part of the amendment. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, Ms. Garza? Mr. Ortiz stated, to how many days? Ms. Grantland replied, 30. Mr. Ortiz stated, 30 okay. Ms. Denise Garza, Board Member stated, thank you, Ms. Lopez Valdez. Going back to our backup, it does say it's coming from local funds at approximately \$5 million. So I like the idea that you just threw out, Mr. Ortiz, you know, lowering the substitutes, the days due to the amount that they currently are working. Where does this put us now? Because I agree with Ms. Pena, every employee is valued our new teachers as Mr. Ortiz stated they don't start working July 1. They start they get approved either in August or in the September board meeting which I think we

should change that day to possibly September 30th. I don't recall if we did have a special call board meeting sometime to approve additional staff in September, but I think we should amend the days. I also don't think we should put them in tiers only because even our TIA teachers, yes, they've gotten their monies, but it is a retention stipend. Ms. Pena stated, and if you do the 800 people at \$750, that's \$600,000 to turn around and include them. And I'm sorry, I was raised by different parents that said there's always more money than time and there's more time than life. So please forgive me. When you need the money and it's for people, you always find it and you always get it. I make people a priority. So 600,000 for the 800, instead of just going to give them what's left over, it's very disheartening. It's heartbreaking, very heartbreaking that you tell them, well, whatever's left would divide. Don't think I think any less of you, but I'm sorry, there's no other way to look at that. I apologize for saying that, but it breaks my heart. And I know you don't mean it that way, but that's how I felt. I know you don't mean it that way. I apologize. Ms. Grantland interjected, I get it. I get it. Ms. Pena continued, and I just feel that we, like Denise said, we should treat them all the same and not turn around and not do about the Tiers and do this and do that. Ms. Lopez Valdez interjected, well, let's just make sure not to put words in people's mouths, Ms. Grantland. Ms. Pena stated, well, the Tiers. I don't agree with the Tiers. I just think that we can change it to 30. I'm okay with that. September, break it all the way to September, not July, because the new ones are hired in August and September so right here you're going to leave all the new ones out. When we're going to do a good deed we need to do it good and well because we need our people we need our people to stay and not be picked up from other districts because we're losing a lot of our seniority and a lot of our people that have a lot of quality and the teachers behind feel like why are they leaving us we need them but it's because we make little changes like that. I just want to reconsider because to do Tiers and to do it in this manner and not treat everybody 750 across is a little bit, to me, it's disheartening. That's just my personal opinion. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, Ms. Grantland. Ms. Grantland stated, Madam President, I don't want to diminish anyone in this plan. What I want to do is make sure that we look at the equity in the situation. The equity, if you look, if you consider TIA stipends or whatever it was called, incentive money, and you look at that, just that compared to this \$750, I can almost guarantee you that a person who received \$7,000 in a TIA incentive would be willing to say, you know what, I don't need that \$750, give it to other people that can use it. Our classified employees had to have an increase in their insurance costs through no fault of their own, but they came to the plate and put in their part of the solution willingly. There's people that are saying, you know, if my job isn't secure, don't give me a stipend right now. There's people that are saying, you know, we understand the situation. And so because of that and in the spirit of equity, I think that it's a good thing to also look at our own bottom line. And so it is in that spirit that I'm presenting this amendment, not in any other way, shape, or form. I do not minimize anyone in this district. In fact, I maximize them. But I am sure, because we still have that climate study that we proposed that has yet to come, I'm more than sure that our climate in this district, and even at this time it's so sad, is not good. It's not good for many reasons, not for any one reason. But this is one thing that I think we need to consider that. And so my amendment stands. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated thank you. I know Dr. Chavez, you wanted to clarify things but Ms. Gonzalez, you have a question? **Dr. Jesus H. Chavez, Superintendent stated, as I think about the current budget situation, just to review some information and we've got Mary Garza here as well who can provide a bit more information too. Here, we approved a budget that in looking at dollars that were coming in from our local taxes**

and the state, you know, yes, we identified \$17 million shortage. And our Board was very good about saying we have saved dollars over our period of time, right, so that we have the dollars to place there. But yes, that brings that amount down, okay? So I want to begin with that piece. When we say \$17 million, generally what happens, you know, during the school year, we try to save as many dollars as we can. So, I really am not anticipating that we're going to be losing a total of \$17 million that we're short that we're going to have to use our fund balance for that. Right now, I'm thinking that that number, if we look at where we are today, the expenditures that we've had and what we would anticipate for the remainder of the year, I'm thinking that number is going to be about \$15 million, right? So, less than 17. Now, one of the other things that Ms. Garza and I are always thinking about is, all right, so what's coming forward with regards to, you know, expenditures that we've had and the audit? What do we have coming forward as we think about the state budget and where are our tax collections? We give consideration to all those things. And really, the next statement I think will be helpful to you, the board, and to our district and our community. I am understanding that we probably are going to be a lot better than \$15 million shortage, okay? And I say that tonight, you know, as I was thinking about this board meeting, as I was thinking about the \$750,000 per person, \$750 per person. Let me correct that again. \$750 per person. I know. I really would at that point. right? So here, I came in with the idea that one of the things that I wanted to tell you, the board, is that we have a few more dollars. You know, the suggestion tonight was made \$1,500 per person. Now, I don't know that we can get there to that amount, but I do believe that the 750 ought to move up. Now, the discussion in my mind, I think with the board tonight, you know, is it 1,000? Is it 1,100, 1,200? That's probably where I would be comfortable with. And so I wanted to mention that to you that from my perspective, there is some flexibility and some guidance that I'd like to get from the board, you know, as it relates to the amount. So I'm hoping that's helpful to your discussion tonight. And again, I don't think it will place us in a grave, really bad situation based on kind of where I am at right now. Ms. Pena stated, and Dr. Chavez, that would be for everyone, am I correct? Dr. Chavez stated, yes. I mean, I came in with the idea that for everyone. Now here I would like for Ms. Garza just to verify and, you know, talk a little bit about the finances as well. Ms. Pena interjected, it's Christmas, Ms. Garza, remember. Ms. Mary Garza, Director of Finance stated, good evening, Madam Chair and Dr. Chavez, members of the board and audience. As we finalize the closing of the fiscal reporting for June 30, 2025, and we recognize, we finalize the revenues that the state is supposed to send the district. And one thing to keep in mind is that as we plan for a budget on a year-to-year basis with projected enrollment for future years. The state takes about a year and a half, almost a year and three-fourths. Our fiscal year starts July 1, and the state goes September through August. But it takes the state anywhere from September of any given year to the following state year into March to close out school districts. So for us, the final closing of fiscal year 23-24 occurred in April of 25, which meant that the state finalized our revenues in 24-25. So, when we did our budget for 24-25, it was based on a shortfall of approximately \$27 million. And it was based on having state values, because the previous three years, the state had indicated that the property worth for Brownsville Independent School District properties were higher than what the Appraisal District had determined. the final number that the state came in at for 24 -25 was local values. So because we were paid state funds on local values and they finalized the amount of funding that they had to

give the district for 23-24, we're ending the year in a positive amount. So the we're not going to have a deficit fund balance for 24-25 It's going to be a positive fund balance, so therefore the district has the funds in order to cover a retention stipend. Now one thing to keep in mind is that when we bring the retention stipend to the Board it is a to assist the employees for those that have been working here. And the reason why the retention stipend came about was because of COVID, because people had to come to work during COVID time, and the ESSER funds allowed for those retention stipends to be paid, because there was extra work having to do while educating the kids remotely. So the district has always had a cutoff point. And we've been, I looked at last year's numbers and based on the criteria, and this year's criteria matches last year's criteria, we ended up qualifying about 98 % of the staff between the full-time and last year for the first time, we included individuals that were hired after July 1 but worked, but reported as of their first reporting day in their calendar. So that means coaches that were hired for the very first time, teachers that were hired for the very first time and reported as of the first reporting date were also included. Now, any individuals that were hired a week after the calendar started or a month later, then those were the ones that were not qualified. The substitutes there was two categories of substitutes last year that were paid. One was your regular, we refer to them as regular subs, right? Those that work only as a substitute and have not worked in any other capacity, and those needed to meet the 71 days. For X reasons, we had a lot of what we call permanent substitutes, right? They had to be in the classroom every single day. And then for the individuals that have already retired and come back and substitute after retirement, then for those individuals, the number of days was reduced. So currently, based on that analysis and based on the information that was being provided this week, for the substitutes than anybody that works 30 days or more within the time frame from August the 11th, which was the first reporting date for students, through November 19, because we know exactly how many individuals worked, that's a total of 406 substitutes. So, 30 and more is 406. So that's about half of the substitute population. Now, based on having to qualify approximately 5,600 employees, that is the reason why the agenda has approximately \$5 million. Once the programmer goes through the system and identifies all the employees, roughly we were given about 5,600 individuals. Once he finalizes the number, and he won't finalize it until you approve it, the agenda, then that's how the \$5 million came about. If we were to do \$1,000, plus 10 % for benefits for approximately 5,600 employees, 5,640 -something. It's \$6.2 million. If you do \$1,250, then that would be \$7.7 million. Now, one thing that you will see later on is once we process the stipend, we will bring a budget amendment to the board to recognize the budget for these monies. Yes, it was discussed during the approval of or the compensation plan. It was added to the compensation plan as to be determined. It did not have a specific dollar amount. It was discussed. The actual payout of that money was not embedded into the budget because of the fact that as we identified the priorities to bring to the board during the budget process, we were already working into a deficit. So, we did not physically put the budget in. But because of our positive finances outlook outcome that materialized for 24-25 the fact that we ended up getting local values then that's the reason why the administration is comfortable with processing this payment and reviewing over dollar amounts. Mr. Carlos Elizondo, Board member stated, may I ask a question? Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez stated, Mr. Elizondo, first I have Ms. Ortiz, then Ms. Gonzales, then Mr. Ortiz, then Ms. Grantland, and then Ms. Gonzales. Ms. Jessica Gonzalez, Board Member

stated, thank you. I already forgot what else I'm going to say. Let me go back to all my notes. Ms. Grantland, I see where you're coming from with what you said. I did take the notes. I completely understand it. I would much rather, I'm torn with the Tiers. I really am torn. I don't want to exclude, I don't want to call it exclude. This is what I would much rather you have said. And I'm not talking, obviously I would like to. And I was going to say yes, I was going to say 750, but since Dr. Chavez threw in a couple of extra bucks, so let me amend what I was going to say to what I'm going to say now. I would much rather you have said \$1,000 for all and 35 days for subs, which means they worked half the semester. Ms. Grantland stated, I think, madam, if you would allow me to, I think I can solve this without further discussion. Is that all right? Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, yes. Ms. Grantland continued, okay having heard this information. I fully agree. It should be \$1,000 or 1,200 if you can Okay, 1,250 Highest bidder. The other thing is, I lost my train of thought. The other thing that I noticed in this is that I was thinking in terms of equity, in terms of money, but because this is a retention incentive, Why not TIA also, people? Because they need to be retained just as well as anybody else. I just couldn't in my mind justify, if I were a TIA teacher receiving over \$7,000, and then taking \$750 that could have been made to increase somebody else's money. I just couldn't reconcile that. However, having heard this information, having heard the outlook information, I think that \$1,250 would be good. I'd like to amend it to \$1,250,000 for everyone. And the sub's 30 days, 35 days. Mr. Elizondo stated, I'll second that. Ms. Pena stated, yes. Thank you for your reconsideration, Ms. Grantland. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, so we already had a first and a second, now it's amended. Mr. Ortiz still has a question. Yeah, a question. I just want to make sure that we're absolutely clear on what we discussed a little while ago. Dr. Chavez, Ms. Garza, thank you very much for giving us that explanation. Dr. Chavez, if you feel comfortable with the recommendation, I, like I said, I advocate for employees all the time. I just want to make sure that it's worded correctly on the amendment, okay? You indicated all employees, 1,250. All right, now, are we also going to amend the July 1st starting date to September the 30th? Ms. Pena interjected, yes, I think we should do that. Ms. Grantland replied, I think that HR needs to help us to reconcile that, you know, however it'll work out so that there's the capability of including all the people that should be included. Ms. Pena stated, okay, so we can do that? We can bring it from July to September 30th? **Ms. M. Garza stated, it's July, the way it's worded and the way we've accounted for the individuals, it's everybody that was hired as of July 1, or if they were hired and reported on the first working day of their calendar. So, any new teachers that were hired and started working August the 5th, for example. Now, if they got hired August the 12th, August the 10th, August the 21st, September the 2nd, September the 6th, those are not included.** Mr. Ortiz stated, got it, okay. **Ms. M. Garza continued, so the count represents.** Ms. Pena interjected, how many are those? How many are those? **Ms. M. Garza replied, we won't know the exact number.** Ms. Lopez Valdez interjected, yeah, let's let Mr. Ortiz finish his question. Mr. Ortiz continued, okay, I'm in total agreement with that. Now, my last question is on the substitutes beginning August the 11th to the 21st, that's 35 days, half a semester, is that correct? **Ms. M. Garza replied, based on the new number of days, yes, 35 is half because there's 71 days.** Mr. Ortiz stated, I'm good with that. Ms. M. Pena stated, question, yes, and Mary, how difficult would it be because you know how and how people got hired and they were already in the teachers and the principals, Ms. Gallegos can attest to this, were waiting and something happened and you know the paper didn't come in or we're waiting for this or we're doing this because we're short-handed here because I got all the calls. How difficult would it be to make that

instead of the July the 1st to bring it to September 30th. How many people are we talking? Not a lot, but I'd hate to leave anybody out who didn't get officially to start the class because there's something where it didn't go through, the computers keep going down. How difficult would it be to just make it September 30th and that covers pretty much all the new teachers and not leave anyone out, because something, a glitch that might have happened when they couldn't start that actual date. Because I remember we got calls on that, and we even called and asked for information. How difficult would it be to move it to September 30, and that covers all the teachers? Anybody that got hired, how difficult would it be? Because to me, it's something that we need to treat everyone equal and valued. All of us are valued 100%. And, you know, I don't think it would be that many but it would show that we value every single one of them and it's not their fault when we fall behind on getting the paperwork approved to getting the teacher or the employee into that position. **Ms. M. Garza replied, it's going to take the programmer a little bit more time and we may not be able to make the deadline but we could certainly pay those individuals at a later time. It may not be that many.** Ms. M. Pena interjected, right, they won't get it in December 19th, but they'll get it when they come back. **Ms. M. Garza stated, yes for those individuals that, because right now, the programmer already did preliminary work to identify these individuals. The other ones that were hired and reported, say, anywhere from August the 6th to September, let me see.** Ms. M. Pena interjected, my question is, it can be done, is what I'm saying. They'll just get it later. **Ms. M. Garza stated, yes, it can be done.** Ms. Pena stated, and they'll get it later. **Ms. M. Garza stated, but paid later because we may not be able to incorporate it in order to be able to run the payrolls.** Ms. M. Pena stated, okay and I think getting it later as opposed to getting nothing never, it's okay. **Ms. M. Garza stated, now keep in mind that September 1st was Labor Day and that was a holiday.** Ms. M. Pena stated, yes. Mr. Elizondo stated, it's not the employees fault. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, September 2nd. So how about this? We have a first. We have a first and a second. Ms. M. Pena stated, can we read the motion again? Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, yes. Give me a second. I want to thank everyone for the thoughtful discussion based off of facts and data. And I would like, Ms. Grantland, if you could please restate your motion. We have a first and a second. And then we can call the vote. Ms. Grantland stated, after all this discourse. Ms. M. Pena stated, can you add the 30th piece, Ms. Grantland stated, what? Ms. Pena stated, can you add the September 30th. Ms. Grantland stated, hold on yea, I move that we provide a retention incentive in the amount of \$1,250 to every employee in our school district with the parameters of employment to be determined by our Finance Department and HR services. In other words, include everyone if possible with those dates that you have mentioned. **Ms. Ms. Garza stated, okay so can I read the item? Okay. Recommend approval of resolution 25/25-26 for retention stipend to be paid on or after December 19, 2025 for all full-time and permanent part-time employees who were employed as of September 2, 2025 and who remain employed in the same capacity on December 19, 2025 and substitute teachers who work 35 days or more during the period of August 11, 2025 through November 21, 2025 in the amount of \$1,250.** Ms. Patricia Perez, Executive Assistant stated, and the new hires? Ms. Grantland stated, I so move. **Ms. M. Garza stated, the new hires?** No, we changed the date to September 2nd. Mr. Elizondo stated, second. **Ms. M. Garza stated so that picks up the new hires.** Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, we already have a first and a second. Ms. M. Pena stated, Ms. Daniela, I was asking because I know that would it be okay just to move to September the 30th because some hat didn't get approved to start till September 5th or 6th? If you put the second, they don't qualify by four or five days. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated

Ms. Garza. Ms. D. Garza stated, well, not just the subs, but even classified individuals. If we're asking for our subs to work 35 days, if any classified employee got hired after and has worked 35 days, then I think we should include them as well. Ms. M. Pena stated, yes, ma'am. So could we change that to the 30th? Ms. D. Garza stated, so I'm just saying that's why I think September 30th is better. Ms. M. Pena stated, I agree. Is that possible? Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, Ms. Garza, is this possible, the September 30th? From what I understand, it sounds like it is going to be back. Can you just confirm? It looks like the system had already been worked out, is my understanding. Ms. M. Pena stated, but she said they could correct it and it'll be paid later. So it can be done. You already answered that question. **Ms. M. Garza stated, the individuals that we're going to include outside the first reporting date of their working calendar would take a little bit more time to identify. So those few individuals we can probably pay in January. And the ones that met, the ones that we had already identified based on the anticipated dates that we used last year, those have been identified already, so we're ready to move on. We just needed the final amount.** Ms. M. Pena interjected, so it can be done. Ms. Lopez Valdez interjected, hold on. Let's just. **Ms. M. Garza interjected, it can be done, but of course, once we know what that number is, that's going to add additional cost for those individuals.** Ms. Lopez Valdez interjected, okay I'm going to try to wrap it up. Ms. Garza has a question. Ms. Grantland has another one. Ms. D. Garza stated, I would like for it to be anybody hired on or before September 30th, but also I think those that you identify that will not get paid in December 19th, if we could have a follow up of who the employees are because we will be the ones getting the calls. That way we have a clear clarification on how to respond to them. Like you're not getting it right now, but you're going to get it in January. And if we can give it to them even maybe possibly before the January payroll, I don't know how that works. But that way they can have it that they know, okay, on this day you're going to receive your check because you did not make that cut off before we had approved the item. **Ms. M. Garza stated, once, it may take about a week to identify these individuals, maybe less. It depends. I can't speak for the programmer, but I know I was speaking to him this past week on gathering the data. So I'll ask him to identify the additional individuals. Once we have those individuals, we can always contact them and let them know because the board agenda timeframe changed as far as who's included. If we cannot get it in by the December 19, then we can go ahead and pay. We'll let them know that they'll get paid afterwards.** Ms. Neida Ruth Grantland stated, Madam President. Okay, Amendment to the amendment to the amendment to the amendment. **Ms. Perez stated, new hires, September 30, right?** Ms. Grantland replied, September 30. **Ms. Perez stated, yes, ma'am. I got it.** Ms. M. Pena stated, and one more quick question for Ms. Mary. Ms. Mary, we only have one programmer doing this? **Ms. M. Garza replied, we have on the business side, we have two programmers, and they help each other out. And there was other things that they had to work on programming-wise. And then this last week, we gave him this one to work on, so...** Ms. Pena stated, BISD has two programmers for the whole district. **Ms. M. Garza stated, no. I said for the business side, there are two programmers.** Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, okay Ms. Grantland, can you wrap it up for us? Ms. Grantland stated, I call the question. Ms. Pena stated, and Pat, could you read it one more time what we're going to vote for? **Ms. Perez replied, yes, ma'am. The amended motion is \$1,250 for all employees, the subs who work 35 days, and new hires on or before September 30. Those are the changes. OK. Please vote. Thank you everyone for supporting our staff.**

Amended Motion made by Neida Ruth Grantland, seconded by Carlos Elizondo, and unanimously carried to recommend approval of Resolution 25/25-26 for retention stipend in the amount of \$1,250 to be paid on or after December 19, 2025 for all full-time and permanent part-time employees who were employed on or before September 30, 2025 and who remain employed in the same capacity on December 19, 2025. Substitute teachers who worked 35 days or more during the period of August 11, 2025 through November 21, 2025 shall also receive the retention stipend in the amount of \$1,250. Employees hired on or before September 30, 2025 who cannot be processed in time for the December 19, 2025 payroll due to identification or system constraints shall receive their stipend at a later date as determined by the Financial and Human Resources Department. The Finance and Human Resources are authorized to finalize eligibility, identify qualifying employees, and ensure implementation consistent with motion. (7-0-0)

VI. Conference Presentation(s):

- A. Presentations regarding RFQ 26-131 Board Legal Advisor Services as required on the specifications of the request for qualifications.

Amendment: Item A Agenda item should read RFQ #26-131

Ms. Rosie Pena, Director of Procurement Services stated, good evening, Madam Chair, Board members, Dr. Chavez. Tonight, we're going to wrap up the procurement cycle for RFQ 26-131, Board Legal Advisory Services. I'm going to make a quick presentation on the presentation and the rules of engagement. It is much like last night's, and so we're going to follow the same processes. We're going to go through the process that we use. We'd use a qualification method of procurement following TEA education guidelines when requesting professional services. The request for qualifications published two consecutive weeks as required by education code.

Carlos Elizondo stepped out at 6:33 p.m.

This RFQ was also extended for a week for lack of vendor participation when the solicitation was required to be submitted. Registered vendor firms were notified through our e-bidding system, and due to the importance of this RFQ, we allowed both online and manual submissions of the bid. This is your award schedule, as also is included in your binder. The responding firms have drawn for their place on the respective presentation. The firms are being kept in the procurement office until their turn to present. Each responding firm has been allowed five representatives in the boardroom during their presentations, and once the responding firm has completed their presentation and has answered all questions, they will be guided back to the procurement office. The length of the presentation is the same as yesterday, 30 total minutes, 10 minutes for presentation, 20 minutes for questions and answers. At the direction of the Board President, each board member will be limited to two questions. During the question and answer portion, the Board of Trustees must ask the same questions of all presenting firms. Because this is a request for qualification, discussion, or fees at this time is not permitted. Time will be managed in the same manner we use for public audience. And again, before we begin the firm presentations, I'd like to thank my team, who is again here assisting us with disqualification.

Carlos Elizondo returned at 6:34 p.m.

So I will be calling the first presenter in the order of their draw. The first law firm to present is a firm of O'Hanlon, Demerath, and Castillo from Pharr, Texas. Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, Mr. Salinas? *Mr. Miguel Salinas, Board Attorney stated, yes, ma'am, would you like me to act as the Board moderator and official timekeeper for this process?* Ms. Lopez Valdez stated yes, please, thank you, Mr. Salinas. *Mr. Salinas stated, all right thank you.*

Mr. Miguel Salinas stated, yes good evening. My name is Miguel Salinas, I am the BISD staff attorney. The Board has appointed me to moderate the presentation and act as official timekeeper. The process will be as follows. The Board has allotted 30 minutes for presentation. The first 10 minutes will be for your presentation, the remaining 20 minutes will be set aside for question and answers. The Board has preliminarily decided that each Board Member will have the opportunity to ask two questions which works out to approximately one and a half minute per question. I mention this because we will strictly enforce time limits. I will give you two signals. At the initial presentation, I will give you a number one at the nine-minute mark. During the question and answer session, I will signal two minutes at the 18 minute mark. We have a clock that is counting down the time and will sound when time expires. When the alarm goes off, I will ask you to stop your presentation. Are there any questions? Mr. Eden Ramirez, Attorney stated, no questions, thank you. Mr. Salinas stated, if not, we have set the timer at 10 minutes and you may proceed.

Mr. Eden Ramirez, Attorney stated good evening to everyone, and thank you so much for the opportunity to be here tonight and present to you all a little bit more about our firm. We've been having the privilege to get to know you over the last two years, but it's always a great opportunity to talk a little bit more about us, who we are, what we do, and how our firm has evolved over the last two years and how we've grown and what we do now. And so I'm going to start off by introducing myself. My name is Eden Ramirez. I'm one of the shareholders with the law firm of O'Hanlon, Demerath, and Castillo. I also have with me Mr. Kevin O'Hanlon, who's going to be coming up here in a few minutes. And I also have Mr. Eric Flores joining me here today. Just some of our attorneys in our firm who make up our team and make up our law firm in everything that we do. A little recap of, again, who we are. You have some of this in the packet that you have there. But we've been in business for over 35 years, right? Longer than I've been alive. So a testament to the longevity of our firm, our presence in the state, and the stability that we bring with a firm like ours to our customers. clients. And so we're very proud of that history that we've had here. We were founded by Mr. Kevin O'Hanlon, who used to serve as general counsel for the Texas Education Agency. And so as former General Counsel for the Texas Education Agency and one of the principal authors of the revision of the new education code when it changed, we have a very close tie to education law stemming from the author of the education code as we have itself. But we do have presence all across the state. We have four offices, Fort Worth, Texas, San Antonio, Texas. We like to call it our Hill Country office. We have Austin, Texas, and of course here in the Rio Grande Valley, our Rio Grande Valley office, that gets to serve you. We have a team of 28 professionals in our firm that includes 17 attorneys. We have governance coaches, paralegals, assistants, and we're very proud of the diversity of our firm that looks like the state of Texas. We are 15 bilingual members in our firm, including our attorneys, 16 minority staff members, 19 women. So we're very proud of the team that we bring forward that we present to you from a cross section of diversity of individuals in the state. I'm very proud that our attorneys bring with us very unique skills. We have in our firm former federal prosecutors, former state prosecutors. We have former middle school and high school principals, former public information officers. As you can see, our attorneys come from a diverse range of background and experiences, thanks to our ability to recruit individuals who we believe can bring not just the legal knowledge of the classroom, but also bring with us the acumen of real-world experience for all the different experiences that any school district goes through in here. I talked a little bit about our offices, but here's where we're all located, right? In the Rio Grande Valley, we have Mr. Benjamin Castillo, who you've had the pleasure to work with, myself, Ms. Shelly Smith, Mr. Flores, Ms. Alyssa Aleman, Andrea Vela, servicing you. In

other areas, we have in here our individuals from other offices, including our support staff and our attorneys for SPED, who also service you, Ms. Leslie Alvarez, and a bunch of other attorneys that come with our firm. But we're very proud of everything that we do here. You know, our mission is always purpose -driven. We want to represent you with everything that we can for you and for your needs. We're grounded in education law. We are preventative, not reactive, so we don't wait for things to happen. We want to make sure we take care of things before they become issues to you, and we pride ourselves in our accessibility and our response. I will say that our customer service is unparalleled. We are 24 -7 attorneys representing your district, your board, and helping your administration. It doesn't matter what day of the year it is, what time of the day it is, we are always available directly with the attorneys and directly aligned with us. You're not having any gatekeepers to reach us or to work with us. And I think we've been able to prove that over the last two years working with you in our accessibility. And, of course, it goes without being said that we are a one -stop shop. When you hire us, you only need us. You don't need to hire anyone else or bring anything else. There's nothing under the school law world that we have not seen, that we have not experienced, and that we've not been able to handle extremely well. So for purposes of brevity, right, we have listed a bunch of these for you here. You have them in your packets, but I'm going to pass it on now to my colleague, Mr. Eric Flores, who's going to continue with the next portion of the presentation. Members of the board, Madam President, Dr. Chavez, Eric Flores, as Mr. Ramirez said, so included with our firms is our research capabilities. We want to be able to provide accurate, immediate information. So we're not only in the textbooks, we're not only in the codes, we're also using a very sophisticated database. Of course, Lexis, we have direct access to TEA commissioners. opinion, so on and so forth. So we provide very accurate and very immediate information when that research is needed. Now our commitment to the public is financial responsibilities. We had a very important item before us yesterday. Myself as a former federal prosecutor who headed financial crimes prosecutions, our commitment is to bring very effective billing practices, but most importantly, when it comes to budget time, that it's very transparent, especially for your finance department, to know exactly where we're at. So our billing practices is offered on a flat fee. So what does that mean? If there's zero legal work, it is at a certain amount. And it also means that if there is a very extensive amount of legal work, you will know exactly where our fee is at because it is a flat fee regardless of how much work is produced for the district. You never have to guess where we are at and most importantly, we are transparent and very accountable as to when it comes to those billing practices. So moving on to our clients as you can see we have represented countless entities across the state of Texas as well as the Rio Grande Valley to include so districts like yourself, Conroe, which is the seventh largest in Texas and Midland, El Paso, providing general counsel to them. As you can see here, there's over a dozen clients throughout the valley and the state. Now, coming to our satisfaction guarantee, what are we guaranteeing the district? And what we are guaranteeing is that we have over 30 years of specialized experience in this field for Brownsville ISD not only for your staff but as well for the board we have tailored solutions and most importantly we are a partner in education with you all from the first step all the way to the last step which means when you all come to make that decision you guys are well informed you guys have the best advice and we are subject matter experts when it comes to education law. Thank you. This concludes my portion of the presentation. I will now hand it off to Mr. O 'Hanlon. Mr. Kevin O'Hanlon stated, actually I need to correct something. It's been four and a half years since we've been here. So, we believe past is prologue and so I want to talk a little bit about what we've managed to accomplish during our tenure here. When we were first hired,

some of you that were on the board in 2021 will remember that there were a whole amount, a large number of pending special education cases that were unresolved. They've all been resolved. We won all of them. We have settled none of them and so we have resolved your special education docket. In addition to that, there are no new pending special education matters. We have managed to work with your staff, and you've got a good special education staff, to head those off. So there's no pending special ed matters coming down the pipe that we have to deal with. With respect to finances, those of you that are on the board will remember that we were involved in both multiple rounds of disaster pennies, dealing with that, and spinning off the second disaster penny, a battery election, which passed with the assistance of the teacher organizations in a, frankly, a tough environment. As a result of that, we feel that we've been instrumental in helping the district raise way more money than you have spent on us over that period of time. With respect to HR matters, we have multiple, we have won every case that's been resolved, so we were in four cases so far that were pending at the time that we took over the assignment. In district court, I've got one pending in the Fifth Circuit, the Lucio matter that we just recently won in the trial court. We think that we're going to win that. We've got one pending matter with respect to Tolman. I just filed a summary judgment on that with respect to hopefully the resolution of that. In addition to that, you have done, the way you've assigned labor, Mr. Salinas does a number of cases, and we've pitched in to assist him with the process of the caseload that he's managed in order to lighten the load to help the advisement of the district. So we think that if you look at the pending matters and the ascendancy, if you will, of ongoing legal controversy, there really is none. And we think that's because we've given sound advice to the board to avoid legal peril. It's not all us. I'm not trying to take credit for your decisions. I'm not saying that, but together, we've managed to avoid additional liability.

Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, thank you very much for your presentation. Board members, let's go ahead and remember that we have two questions. The same question has to be asked to all firms and we'll go ahead and start with Ms. Pena. If you only have one question, that's okay too. Just make sure to ask the same question to every single firm.

Ms. Minerva Pena, Board Member stated, how long have all of you been practicing and working with school laws and regulations? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, me 48 years plus, 46 of those were school law or related civil rights stuff that went along with it, HR stuff. Ms. Pena stated, 48 or 46, pick a number. Mr. O'Hanlon replied, ugh. Ms. Pena stated, 48 years of school law? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, 48 years of practicing, over 48 years I've been licensed. Ms. Pena stated, I mean school law specifically. Mr. O'Hanlon replied, 46. Ms. Pena stated, okay and your partners? Mr. Eden Ramirez replied, yes, I've been licensed for about eight years and I've been practicing school law since before I graduated when I was clerking for TEA, so all eight years. And before that I was a school administrator. Mr. Eric Flores stated, I believe licensed since 2017, since then, I have about five years in public education, serving as either general counsel or of counsel, or assisting in those matters. And then, of course, I represented the United States of America as a federal prosecutor, prosecuting financial crimes. Ms. Pena stated, thank you, my next question. Mr. O'Hanlon stated, in addition, we have, just to finish that off, Leslie McCollum's been practicing school law for 40 years. Edward Smith, who has just recently gotten off the Third Court of Appeals, has been doing judging and including in that education for about 15 years. Justin Demerath, who is doing the social media case of which you're a part, has been doing 25 years. Ms. Pena stated,, and these are all your law firms, yes? Mr. Ramirez replied, yes. Ms. Pena stated, thank you. Next question. What attracted you to come to

BISD and ask to be their school board attorneys? Mr. Ramirez replied, well, I'll start by saying that what attracts us to keep working with you is really y'all. I think the Board is an exciting board. You have a dynamic board. I enjoy coming to your board meetings. I think that it's always an opportunity for us to be part of a team, and I've enjoyed working with you. I know Ben has as well. I know Eric has as well, and Kevin. Sometimes when we all have a meeting, we do ask ourselves, So who's going to go? And it's usually in the, well, I'll take it or I'll go manner. And so we've actually enjoyed our time a lot with BISD. Believe it or not, there are some times where we don't submit back to a district we work with because we don't think that we either were productive or contributed something meaningful or were part of it. And so the contrary with you all, the opportunity to keep working with you is what excites us to apply with you again. Mr. O'Hanlon stated, let me add that we think that we piloted the notion of flat fee work in the state of Texas. We've done more of it than any other law firm out there. We're doing it on a belief that we think that if it's a flat fee, you'll call us. If you call us early, we'll prevent something from happening rather than have to fix it after it goes bad. It's faster and more efficient to prevent problems than do that. And we think that given the state of where you are with respect to new controversies, we've proved that theory with this district. Mr. Flores stated, I'll have to caveat off what Mr. Ramirez said I represent entities throughout Cameron County, some of the neighboring cities. So what specifically attracts me again is the work that this Board this governing entity has put forth before the district you're all size the way y'all conduct yourselves, even recently with passing the budget and filling the vacancy. So it's really inspiring to come and work with an entity that is a shining star. So again, I caveat of what Mr. Ramirez said, I enjoy working for each and every one of y'all to include your all's wonderful staff

Mr. Carlos Elizondo, Board Member stated I have no questions. Thank you.

Ms. Neida Ruth Grantland, Board Member stated, have one question and Is Board development training a part of your package of services? Mr. Ramirez replied, we have made it in the past, Trustee Grantland. So when we have done any of those, I've spoken to Dr. Chavez about those, and we've included them as part of our flat fee. Mr. O'Hanlon stated, we can, we have that capacity. We have two Lone Star governance trainers in the firm. Ms. Cara Blue and Dr. Jacinto Ramos. Yeah, and so we have the ability to do that. So, this is the qualifications. We want to present their qualifications to you. Whether you want that in or not, we'll negotiate with respect to the contract. Ms. Grantland stated, yes. What do you mean by negotiate? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, well, this is a two-stage process. The first stage is, as you heard during the presentation, this wasn't about fees. This was about qualifications. We have the qualifications to present that. Then depending on what you want us to do the flat if we and if you want a flat fee the flat fee will be adjusted up or down up or down to reflect what you want us to do. Ms. Grantland stated, okay so my understanding is it is not a part of the package you're presenting of services but it can be added for an extra fee. Mr. O'Hanlon stated no ma'am that we have not presented a fee because that's the rules of the engagement. Ms. Grantland stated, I see. Mr. O'Hanlon continued, so we will be happy to discuss that when we get down to that. Ms. Grantland stated, so it's in the scope of what we ask you. Mr. O'Hanlon replied, yes. Ms. Grantland stated, okay, thank you. Thank you.

Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, and very quickly, my two questions which you all have probably answered already, for evaluation of your litigation experience, can you identify three cases you personally tried from beginning compliance stage through to a jury verdict and summarize

involvements? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, I'd start off probably not to a jury case with Edgewood v. Kirby, 1, 2, 3, and 4, to the Supreme Court, from trial court to the Supreme Court, I filed the original answer in Edgewood v. Kirby with respect to that, I'm trying to think of actual jury trials that are hard to get these days. I haven't done a jury trial in about three years. Most of what we're doing, the other litigation experience that is probably relevant is, we're involved in the social media case out in California. We have been involved in multiple lawsuits involving the Commissioner of Education, from mass mandates, which went to the Supreme Court, to various challenges, Houston ISD, which went to the Supreme Court. So we've done a lot of kind of major litigation. The A to F lawsuits, both versions, which went to the 15th, those are probably the ones most relevant to that. In addition, I probably tried, back when I was doing what I call retail stuff, I was doing criminal defense, I probably tried close to 100 jury trials. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, thank you. And my second question is, given the current legal landscape in Texas, rising challenges in special education, increased political scrutiny of school boards, TEA interventions, curriculum departs, and heightened public records demands, how does your firm specifically prepare and protect districts to navigate these pressures while keeping governance stable and students focused? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, we have a PIA department that does that pretty much exclusively and we'll tailor that work to what you do. We've been doing that for the district in terms that you have a pretty good internal PIA operation run by Mr. Salinas so that we don't we don't we don't do all of it. Mr. Salinas does his office does most of it. We're there to support on need because it's a flat fee, so if it gets sent to us. With respect to, you said regulatory stuff, TEA, we're more involved with protecting districts against overreach by the Texas Education Agency than any law firm in the state. Full stop. There's nobody else that has done that. With respect to special education, our philosophy is to work with your staff to prevent problems before they start and to deal with things at the ARD committee level and advise the process early so as not to incur liability. The fact that you have had no new special education filings, I think since we've been here, tells some of that tale. Not all us, the staff, Ms. Lippa does a great job, and so it's, well, I'm not taking full credit for it, but we'd like to be in the spotlight a little bit.

Mr. Frank Ortiz, Board Member stated, yes I only have two questions and any one of you can answer it. Here's my first question. How would you determine when the district should settle a case versus litigating it? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, we don't, okay. Full stop. We don't make that determination. We will sit with you and discuss as long as you want necessary, the pluses and minuses of settling the case, the risks and advantages of settling the case, but that decision is 100 % the decision of the Board of Trustees, not us. We will be happy to talk to you as long as you want with respect to the merits of the case, but we don't tell you that you need to settle the case. We will chat with you and figure out when you're ready to do it and on what terms. Second question. Can you describe a time when you prevented a board from making a costly legal mistake? Mr. Flores replied, yeah, I'll use two examples. So I will use one example where I did have a governmental entity that inappropriately held an election. And the law was very clear as to what it should have been. So essentially, we advised the entity, although it was a minor technicality, the black and law white, read that a new election needed to be held. So we held the line as a law firm and of course advised as to the importance of having election integrity. So we made sure that we had an entirely new election. We actually took that case to trial and rendered it to a verdict with that decision. So the costly legal mistake that they avoided there was not following the election code to the T and to ensure that election integrity remained intact for the voters as to the person who they chose to elect. Mr. O'Hanlon interjected, let me add one at some risk. Y'all were fussing around, to be honest with you,

about filling a vacant seat. and it could have been in violation of the election code. And we wrote an opinion that advised you with respect to the legal requirements of that. Again, circumstances where there were divisions of opinion in terms of that, wasn't our job to tell you what to do, but it was our job to tell you what the legal peril was, and we think that we did that.

Ms. Denise Garza, Board Member stated, I have two questions. First one is, have you previously outsourced portions of your legal work to other firms, consultants, or vendors? Please provide examples, and why would you need to outsource work? Mr. O'Hanlon replied no. Ms. Garza stated, and my question number two, describe your process for outsourcing legal work. Will the board have the opportunity to review and approve any outsourcing prior? And how are additional costs being communicated and managed between firm and board? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, we don't. Our bills, if you go back and look at our history of billing, you've gotten the flat fee every month since we started. Except for the first month, because it was only a half a month.

Ms. Jessica Gonzalez, Board Member stated, I have a two-in -one question and it's kind of the same thing that Ms. Garza was saying. So how often do you anticipate needing to outsource work and what safeguards do you have in place to prevent unexpected or escalating cost to the district? Mr. O'Hanlon replied, we don't. So there are a couple of things that I would say that are specialties. The board has a history of engaging bond counsel, which is probably not necessary at this point in time. But that's a specialty that typically gets hired separately by the board. And so we have not, we can't, we can do it, we just haven't. And the preferences for most of the boards that that we deal with have dealt with that. But we don't outsource anything, all right? So our view of the rules, the rules of disciplinary practice of the state bar say that, and so does your policy, they're consistent, we don't hire lawyers for you. You hire lawyers. So if you need another lawyer, you're free to do that, but we're not going to hire one on your behalf, okay? We can't. We need the consent of the client under the ethical rules in order to do that. So you won't see us outsourcing anything.

Mr. Flores stated, yes, so I just wanted to add on, Madam President, to both Ms. Trustee Garza and Trustee Gonzalez's question. As Mr. O'Hanlon said, he said, no, that we don't outsource work. And let me provide the why as to we do not. We consider ourselves a one-stop shop, and we consider ourselves the subject matter expert of education law and representing governmental entities. So we handle everything from internal investigations, which I handle myself in regards to compliance, as well as the litigation standpoint. If we ever find ourselves in litigation, which Mr. O'Hanlon and Mr. Salinas have recently found themselves in. We are there from step one all the way to the last step, which includes trying a case on behalf of Brownsville ISD to a verdict. And we are always confident that those verdicts will come back in favor of Brownsville ISD as we're upholding the rule of law. In addition, we're the subject matter experts when it comes to that. So thank you all so much for the opportunity to present this evening. Mr. Ramirez stated, you know what, I'll add one more thing. They actually hire us to help them. Anyways, thank you all so much for your time, for letting us be here. We appreciate it very much. Mr. O'Hanlon stated, and one other thing, just about jury trials. I've got three Brownsville jury trials scheduled between now and the middle of the summer. We've got some adjustments. We think we're going to avoid some of them. But we will try cases. I'm board certified in civil trial law and civil court law.

Ms. Rosario Pena stated, our next law firm to present is that of Baltazar Salazar, attorney at law from Houston, Texas. Miguel Salinas, Staff Attorney stated, let me know when you're ready, Mr. Salazar. Mr. Baltazar Salazar replied, I'm ready. Mr. Salinas stated, all right. Just some opening comments. My name is Miguel Salinas. I'm the BISD staff attorney. The board has appointed me to moderate the presentation and act as official timekeeper. The process will be as follows. The board is allotted 30 minutes for presentation. The first 10 minutes will be for your presentation. The remaining 20 minutes will be set aside for questions and answers. The board has preliminarily decided that each board member will have the opportunity to ask two questions which works out to approximately one and a half minutes per question. I mention this because we will strictly enforce time limits. I will give you two signals. At the initial presentation, I will give you a number one signal at the nine minute mark. During the question and answer session, I will signal two minutes at the 18 minute mark. We have a clock that is counting down the time and will sound when time expires. When the alarm goes off, I will ask you to stop your presentation. Are there any questions about the process? Mr. Salazar stated, yes, on the 18 minutes, that's going to be our all six questions going to come or seven questions at the same time? Mr. Salinas stated, no, sir, each Board Member will ask their two questions if they have two questions separately. Mr. Salazar stated, okay, just wanna make sure it wasn't one continuous question. Mr. Salinas stated, yes, no. Okay. So if you're ready, sir, we'll set the clock, you may begin.

Mr. Baltazar Salazar, Attorney stated, good evening, Board of Trustees from the Brownsville Independent School District Superintendent Schools. I've got 32 years of experience, okay? 32 years of having good standing with the state of Texas, good standing in the federal courts. I have practiced all over the United States. I won't go over all the states and all my qualifications. I am licensed in the state of Texas, the federal courts, Western District of Texas. I am also licensed in Wisconsin. I also have appeared in Florida. I've appeared in Kansas. I've appeared in Louisiana, both in federal and state court. So I have 32 years of pretty well-rounded experience as far as trying cases or working cases out. I am a BISD product. I would like to say that I'm probably the only BISD product that is presenting tonight. And, you know, we say believe in BISD and be the best choice. Well, I am a product. I want to, before I go any further, I want to thank the school district, the staff, the faculty, my teachers that were patient enough to tolerate me. Administrators, when they knew that I was wrong, they put me back in place. So first of all, I do want to thank BISD because, but for BISD, I wouldn't have these 32 years of experience. So I do thank BISD staff, faculty, all of my teachers, especially administrators that had to put me back in place. After I left high school, I went, I got my bachelor's degree at, it was called Pan American in Brownsville. And then I went to teach. I taught one year at Los Fresnos High School as an English teacher. And then I taught two years in San Benito CISD as an ESL teacher. I got accepted to law school. I was fortunate. I am a graduate of Thurgood Marshall School of Law. I am on the school board or the law school board of law. of alumni, and I have for the past 15 years. I've also served as the board president for the Alumni Association there at the law school. So all of these are part of my academic background. In 32 years, I've never missed a court. I've never missed a deadline. I've never missed a board meeting. I've never missed a special call board meeting, a workshop. Any time I've been asked for a public entity, such as a Brownsville School District, or Rio Grande City, or the city of Progresso, or San Benito, I've never missed a meeting. Never. I've never been late to a meeting. That, to me, is part of the, I guess, the academic installation that I got from Brownsville ISD. And I also want to let you know that up until two years ago, I was still a certified teacher. I'm not anymore, because I'm not in the classroom anymore. Education runs in my blood. My dad retired with 33 plus years as an

educator with Brownsville Independent School District. My mom, 30 plus years. Three of my sisters, two of them from the Brownsville School District, 30 plus years. And one sister, also in the Dallas area, but she's still in education. Education is in my blood. I was fortunate enough to represent the Brownsville Independent School District for eight and a half years. They were great years. But when I came in, in 2013, there were some problems. And the challenges that I had back then was we had 17 pending special ed cases. In 17, I brought those cases down from 17, and when I left in 2021, we were down to zero. I took great pride in that because we changed the culture of special ed. Instead of BISD versus the student and the parent, it was now BISD with the parent, with the student. We started providing customer service. We started changing the mentality that, you know what, we can beat you. Of course we can. We have an army of attorneys. going and showing more empathy for the student. So from that point of view, I believe, well, I know that I changed the culture while I was there for special education. I've also handled construction defect cases. I am the only attorney, and I don't think any of the attorneys that will come today can say that they have made vendors accountable. Vendors accountable. Everybody comes to the school district, signs contracts, they sign it, they do whatever they do, they get paid, and that's it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I was able to, before I even became the school district's general counsel, I wrote a check for \$3.4 million to the school district, just for the school district, not attorney's fees. That was for the Aiken and Besteiro case. I also supervised the TIWA case, which was the windstorm insurance. On that one, we wrote a check for \$4.2 million to the school district. And then we also filed suit against HealthSmart, which was one of the insurance carriers at that time. We wrote a check for \$1.8 million. Total \$9.4 million that I have been personally responsible for writing back to the school district. Not one attorney can tell you that today. Not one. They can tell you what they charge. And having said that, when I first came in, we reduced the fees from \$1.4, \$1.5 million a year back in 2011, 2012. We brought them down to \$200,000 at that time. So when I set my goals, I pretty much have met them. I always say that results speak for themselves. I'm not, you can check with accounting how many checks we brought to the school district. Results speak for themselves. I don't need to shine on that one. Those are facts. And I know that. Someone's saying, well, he's by himself, he's not going to bring eight attorneys with him, or six attorneys, or five attorneys. Two years ago, actually, a year and a half ago, the San Benito Independent School District had a problem with their performing arts center and their auditorium. They had to stop the project because they had paid approximately \$12.7 million into the performing arts center and the auditorium with one contractor. They brought me in, and I know that even some of the board members were, well, you know, this is little Balta, this is Berkeley surety, Berkeley insurance are worldwide. How is he going to be able to do this? Well, I'm proud to say that last year, almost to the date, I sat down and I got Berkeley insurance to write to San Benito Independent School District, a check for \$13.3 million. Now we're building a performing arts center from the money. We had only spent \$12.7. So they said, Balta, how did you do it to get \$13.3? I said, well, you see these white hairs are not for free. So again, and I know, I was underestimated. But again, proof speaks for itself. The results speak for themselves. You can call anybody so many times. making \$60,000 a month right now in interest, just on my part. And I'm still suing those vendors that are responsible. It's not the end of it. So I believe that's so important because sometimes we don't go after the vendors. And it's just a question of, well, we've got a bad deal. Sorry. But at some point, schools and you all are trustees. As trustees, you need to have somebody that's going to hold those vendors accountable. You're going to have to hold them responsible. Now, if you want to get a team of five or six or eight attorneys, I'm not the person. If you want one good 32-year experience attorney, I'm the one. I may not give you

the news you like, but it's the news that is best for the taxpayer. And ultimately every dollar, every money, these \$9.4 million, they go back to the classroom. That's why we're here. We're here because of the students. So every dollar that we put back goes back to the classroom that I can save the school district. So having said that in the closing, I just want to let you know that results speak for themselves. I have the results. I have the 32 years. And in 32 years, I continue to be an attorney in good standings. But without the Brownsville Independent School District, I could not have had that foundation. So again, thank you very much for this wonderful school district.

Ms. Minerva Pena, Board Member stated, how long have you been working with school laws and regulations specifically? How many years? Mr. Salazar replied, I have been working with the Brownsville Independent School District. I was with the whole 12 and eight and a half years and that so since 2005 is when I started with the Aiken Besteiro, I became General Counsel in 2013 and then I've also been General Counsel for the Rio Grande City Gruia ISD for five years and I've been with San Benito now three years. With San Benito what I do is I do the construction part of it. But I also, I represent administration in the level three grievances. So I am the voice of the administration. Ms. Pena stated, how many years total is that? Mr. Salazar replied, total, that would be 20 years. Ms. Pena stated, Thank you. Mr. Salazar stated, with the construction and the administrative part. Ms. Pena stated, and the school regulation and school law? Mr. Salazar stated, yes, ma'am. Ms. Pena stated, okay. And my next question is, what attracted you to come and apply to be the school board attorney at BISD? Mr. Salazar stated, I have a vested interest in the Brownsville Independent School District. My two granddaughters attend BISD. That's, to me, that's it. So anything I can do, I'm from Brownsville, I grew up in Brownsville. I'm here half the time. My mom lives four or five blocks from here. So I am from Brownsville. A lot of people tell me, hey, Balta, where do you live in Brownsville? I actually have an office here in Brownsville, and I have one in Houston. I spend part of my time in Houston. I spend the other part at South Padre Island. So Brownsville, to me, is home. I mean, this is where all of my close friends are, and they will continue to be.

Mr. Carlos Elizondo, Board Member stated, I have no questions, thank you.

Ms. Neida Ruth Grantland, Board Member stated, Mr. Baltazar thank you for your presentation. I have a question. Is board development training a part of what you offer within the scope of your work with us? Mr. Salazar replied, yes, not only board development, but also special ed development. I have actually presented to this board on procurement procedures back when we had a bond that was approved some years ago. And so we went out for procurement. And so I presented to the board and to the staff on how to procure for that bond that did pass. And that was some time ago. So yes, I have done that. And I have also especially in special ed, because most of the times, the two areas that school districts get in trouble with is special education and employment. Fortunately, the district has a staff attorney that handles a lot of that, but those are the two areas of concern. The other big-ticket item is construction defect. And that is the area that I have been fortunate that I've settled a lot of cases in that area.

Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, my first question is for evaluation of your litigation experience, can you identify three cases you personally tried from beginning compliance stage through to a jury verdict and summarize involvements? The Aiken/Besteiro case, that one we settled it. Actually, that one I started off, we met with the different insurance carriers, we placed everybody on notice, and then we found out that some of the earlier carriers of the

insurance, because we placed all the all the different people that built Aiken and Bustata on notice. Remember, this was 12 years after the school had been built. And then once we did, then they lawyered up and they brought insurance. So I started settling. The very first case that I settled was \$250,000 just by showing up at a mediation that wasn't even BISDs, but it was in Houston. And they wanted to, they had a \$250,000 policy. And they said, you take it or you leave it. We're going to use it in defending something of these. So I can, Mr. Salinas can attest to that. Mr. Salinas represented one of the defendants in that case. So I was there from day one, from the beginning. I did all the depositions. We took depositions here. We did all of the trial work. And then ultimately, we settled with most of the defendants. And then they turned in what's called an arbitration clause. And I argued on behalf of the school district to the Texas Supreme Court. that arbitration in our position was that it didn't apply, because we had taken it specifically out of the contract. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court at that time was very pro-business and very pro -arbitration. So I took that one from the very beginning, from actually showing up to the Aiken and Besteiro, to all the way to arguing it with the Texas Supreme Court. And ultimately, the court sent it back, and we settled it. The last defendant was the train air conditioning. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, thank you. My next question is, given the current legal landscape in Texas, rising challenges in special education, increased political scrutiny of school boards, TEA interventions, curriculum departments, and heightened public records demands, how does your firm specifically prepare and protect districts to navigate these pressures while keeping governance stable and student focused? Mr. Salazar stated, he way you do that is you start at the ground up. You can eliminate a lot of your grievances at level one. I would say 90 % of your grievances should never go to level two. The lower you take care of those, the more time that your staff attorney has, or maybe your staff attorney doesn't even need to address those. Maybe that should be handled by HR, like most school districts. They're not done by a staff attorney. Most school districts don't have a staff attorney. So that would be the first part is administratively. Yeah, of course. We keep, I mean, I'm up to date like everybody else, like every law firm that's going to come out here, we're all digital. Whatever case comes out this afternoon in the Court of Appeals, the Texas Supreme Court, we get emails. So there's no advantage anymore having clerks researching anything. We are, and I am, on the top of my game as far as research is concerned. So that part, you know, we can do that. Regulations, I'm not going to, I don't lobby for any regulations. I mean, I would think that that would be money misspent if you lobbied to try to change the law. To me, it's the law is given to us. As you know, this is a very difficult climate to work in as a school district for financing, for, you know, children leaving our schools, but we still have to, we still have to work within those guidelines. So that's it. I'm not a savior as far as, you know, saving you and trying to go to Austin and change a lot to me it to me. It's a waste of time.

Mr. Frank Ortiz, Board Member stated I have to I have two questions Question number one. How would you determine when the district should settle a case verse litigating it. Mr. Salazar replied, that goes back to and I've always said this, you know if it's an employee you need to look at the facts if it's an employee that has one or two years of service and you know, maybe had a rough time then I don't recommend that I say we try those. The problem with that, of course, is if the jury doesn't believe you, you can get a nice judgment against you. So those, you have to evaluate them. If you've got somebody who's been with the school district 28 years, and Mr. Salinas knows this, 28 years, you bring him before the Board, it's real hard to say no to somebody who's been with the district that long. So to me, one of the barometers one of the barometers is, of course, how long have they been here? Or have they been here very few years? The other part is the offense. Are you trying to terminate them because they've

been late five times in the last six weeks? You can do a growth plan for that. Or are you trying to terminate them because they had inappropriate contact with the student? That's a no-brainer. So that depends. As far as litigation, the construction part of it, that has to do a lot with placing them on notice. In San Benito, I place everybody on notice. And the reason I tell people, why do you put the surveyor on notice? Because the surveyor has insurance. And if that insurance is \$1 million, and the other one is \$5 million, the other one's \$2 million, I'm going to try to get as many people with insurance policies to the table. And then I evaluate, but a lot of times what they'll do is they'll say, you know what? We don't want to spend a half million dollars on defending this case. Will your client take a million dollars? And we just leave us alone. So to be, you have to, every case is different. The personnel ones, as you know, very difficult in the state of Texas. I mean, I've represented principals in the Upper Valley where they go against school districts that are under state control. and even if the hearing officer rules against the school district, the Board in those districts goes ahead and terminates them anyway. Even if the hearing officer, TEA hearing officer does it and then it's very difficult for a teacher and administrator to appeal that and to file a lawsuit because after that it goes appeals to the to the commissioner and the commissioner this year he denied every single appeal, not one or two, every single one of them. So the landscape is not good for administrators or teachers, but those are given, okay. So if it's an employment, the district is almost 95%, you're going to win the case. Because even if you lose it, the commissioner will change it for you. That's a reality. And all you got to do is just look at all the opinions, the commissioner changes them all. Mr. Ortiz stated, thank you, sir. My second question is can you describe a time when you prevented a Board from making a costly legal mistake? Mr. Salazar replied, well, unfortunately, you know, I can only give the Board advice. That's all I can do. There was a case, and it's public information, so I make no bones about it, that Dr. Atkinson case. You know, a lot of people thought that Dr. Atkinson and I were friends, and I still consider her my friend, but There were some comments that were made, and a lot of people don't know this, but I went to testify on behalf of the FBI. I had met with the FBI. I had met with the U.S. Attorney's Office. It was very difficult for me to know that a very seasoned Board Member had asked some questions. And not only that, I mean, they were There was some text on my phone, so I had to share those. It's very difficult to do that, but ultimately, I'm an officer of the court. I have to do it. I didn't like it, but I had to do it. I sat on that stand for a whole day, and I was cross-examined by her attorneys and also by the U.S. Attorney's Office. That was very difficult for me. The other difficult part was, in December of last year in Rio Grande City Grulla, I've always said it's one of the best school districts to work for because they don't terminate people. And last year they implemented a reduction in force and they got rid of, I believe it was 47 administrators. And the Board told me, can you do it? I said, yes I can, but I will not, I would rather walk away from the school district, get some other attorneys to do the dirty work. I will not do it. Number one, I don't need the money. Number two, morally I thought it was just morally wrong, because they terminated people that politically didn't meet their match. So on that one, last year in December, when they said, Mr. Salazar, you're not telling us what you want to hear, what we want to hear. I said, well, guess what? You need to look for another attorney because I'm not going to be your attorney. I'm not going to be your lapdog. So those have been difficult situations because, again, I don't want to lose a contract. But morally, I have some morals. I was taught better than that. Mr. Ortiz stated, thank you, sir.

Ms. Denise Garza, Board Member stated, I have two questions. Have you previously outsourced portions of your legal work to other firms, consultants, or vendors? Please provide examples, and why

would you need to outsource work? Mr. Salazar replied, I never have. The only people that I've had to is not that they're not attorneys. They are experts in, for example, Aiken/Besteiro, we had to get somebody in San Benito, I had to bring in a structural defect. engineer. I'm bringing in a cost engineer. I'm bringing in a soil engineer. I'm bringing it, so I'm bringing that at the cost of the district, but as far as me bringing in another law firm to do my work, never. I do have a very strong relationship with Thompson Horton. Thompson Hortons are the attorneys that I replaced in 2013. They have been so kind to me. I mean, you talk about professional attorneys. I called him up, I said, hey, Chris, now Chris is now retired. Chris, I've got the special ed case. These are the facts. What do you think? He could tell me, you know what, you replace me at BISD, you know, go take a hike. But I've established such a good relationship that they'll, I'll use them as sounding boards and they'll tell me, you know what, look at this code or look at this case or I've got a case just like it, let me send you the documents. I've been fortunate enough that I don't burn bridges. I have a real good relationship with the courts. I have a real good relationship with other attorneys that have been both on the plaintiff's side and on the defense side. So, but as far as me, I mean, you can go back and look at all of my invoices that I ever submitted to the school district, at any school district, and I have never brought in another attorney at the cost of, to my client. Ms. Garza stated, and question number two, describe your process for outsourcing legal work. Will the Board have the opportunity to review and approve any outsourcing prior? And how are additional costs being communicated and managed between firm and Board? Mr. Salazar stated, well, number one, I don't outsource anything. I've never outsourced it. So that would be a no-brainer. If, for example, I had the San Benito case when I filed suit against Davila Construction. What they did was they filed for bankruptcy. So guess what? I'm licensed in the Western District of Texas in bankruptcy. So I got my license and I went to bankruptcy. I've got four or five friends that do bankruptcy every day. And I said, hey, they filed for this. What do I do? They said, here, let me send you the form. I got to ask for leave. So I went to the federal court in bankruptcy in San Antonio, last. January and February and I said, you know, I'm asking for leave. Here's my paperwork and they told me you can go after the construction company, but only after their insurance policies. You cannot go after the company itself or the owner or his assets. So there's a way and the reason is I've established these 32 year relationships with other attorneys that I trust, that I know are experts in their area, and when I know that it's not the area that I can dominate, I ask. But when it's a question of filing one form and getting leave, I can do that with my eyes closed. But if I did it and the Board wanted a specialty, I would clearly, I would have to come to the board and get approval for that. But I'd never, I've never done that to any of the school districts that I've worked for.

Ms. Jessica Gonzalez, Board Member stated, how often, sir, do you anticipate needing to outsource work and what safeguards do you have in place to prevent unexpected or escalating costs to the district? Mr. Salazar replied, well, number one, the fee that I would offer to the district is a flat fee. So in the contract, it's a flat fee, whatever it is, X amount of money a month. So there's, I can't, I mean, by contract, I wouldn't be able to charge it. Number two is, in the eight and a half years I've been here, five and a half with Rio Grande, San Benito, three, City of Progresso, I also represented the Rio Grande City EDC. I am a vendor for Houston ISD. I've never needed to outsource anything.

Ms. Rosario Pena stated, our last presenter for today is a law firm of Walsh, Gallegos, Kyle, Robinson, and Roalson, Austin, Texas. Mr. Miguel Salinas, Staff Attorney stated, Ms. Ortiz, let me know when you're ready. I have some opening remarks and some questions. Ms. Ortiz stated,

yes. Actually, we do have some materials for the Board. Could we pass those out first that way before we get started? *Mr. Salinas stated, yes, of course. My name is Miguel Salinas. I'm the BIST staff attorney. The board has appointed me to moderate the presentation and act as official timekeeper. The process will be the same. The board is allotted 30 minutes for presentation. The first 10 minutes will be for your presentation. The remaining 20 minutes will be set aside for questions and answers. The board has preliminarily decided that each board member will have the opportunity to ask two questions which works out to approximately one and a half minutes per question. I mention this because we will strictly enforce time limits. I will give you two signals at the initial presentation. I will give you a number one at the nine-minute mark. During the question and answer session, I will signal two minutes at the 18-minute mark. We have a clock that is counting down the time and will sound when time expires. When the alarm goes off, I will ask you to stop your presentation. Are there any questions about the process?* Ms. Leandra Ortiz, Attorney stated, no questions. Thank you.

Ms. Leandra Ortiz, Attorney stated, good evening to the board, Madam President, superintendent, board members, and all of the assistant superintendents. It's so nice to be back. I feel like I'm doing a little homecoming here. It's nice to see some familiar faces. It's also nice to see some new faces. So change is good, right? So I want to take this opportunity to give you a little background on our firm, Walsh Gallegos. I am a shareholder partner in the law firm of Walsh Gallegos. I'm very proud of that and proud that I also used to serve Brownsville ISD as its first in-house counsel. And so, I appreciate all of the information and growing that afforded me the opportunity to now be a partner at Walsh Gallegos and serve the Rio Grande Valley, and now hopefully to serve the Brownsville ISD. We have 500 clients across the state of Texas, also we have 64 attorneys, two of which are with me tonight. We have Destiny Gessing, who is a General Ed Lawyer as well as one of our facilities and business So construction procurement, she's your person. And we also have Adriana Rodriguez with us tonight. She is also one of our litigators. And so, as well as myself, we are General Ed Lawyers and litigators. And as you know, we have 64 attorneys in six Texas offices. We are here to serve. We have practically a large group of in-house experts on all things legal. And our mission is basically to serve you, to help serve those who serve kids. That's our mission. That's all we do. All we do is represent school districts. We don't represent educators. We don't represent superintendents. We represent school districts. Pass it off to Destiny so she can talk to you a little bit. Ms. Destiny Gessing stated, good evening. So I'm just going to get into a little bit of what our firm offers in terms of our scope of services. And obviously, this is not going to be an exhaustive list. But as Leandro mentioned, you have three attorneys from three different areas of our firm. However, we do provide general governance, special education, facilities and business, students, employment, and litigation. So those are going to be our six more foundational areas of our scope of services that we do provide to our districts. Now, when we get a little bit more detailed, we do provide general school law. We provide guidance on employment matters, litigation. More recently, we have started offering bond services for school districts going out for bond. We also offer election support when it comes time to moderate and run elections. Myself in the construction area, I help with providing a district full service construction procurement from start to finish. That includes procurement, construction administration, closeout, potential claims for construction defect, anything that you can think of involving construction. I also provide assistance with real estate and we provide real estate services across the board at our firm. We also offer general business and transactional assistance to our clients. Again, this is not it's not an exhaustive list. So we've also expanded services to include bankruptcy. A big topic of

conversation right now is whether district should be self-funded fully funded flex funded. We also offer those types of services in assisting you to procure what is necessary to provide the best insurance coverage for your employees and your staff. So again, you know, we like to think of ourselves as a full-service firm. You really do get every facet of education and school law that you would need. And that's what we pride ourselves on. And I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to Adriana. Ms. Adriana Rodriguez stated, and because we have so many clients, we also know that your needs might be really different. Here in Brownsville, you have a large district. You serve a large number of students, and your issues might be very complex. And so we want to make sure that when we provide services to you, that we're also doing so in a manner that serves you. And that way, we're very client-centric. So maybe you're a 7 AM phone caller, or maybe a 6:45 a.m. phone caller or maybe you are kind of a stream of consciousness, middle of the night emailer or you're someone who would prefer a face-to-face visit, we're willing to accommodate whatever communication style suits you so that you have the information you need to make the decisions that come across your desk. And we know that some of what you send over to your legal counsel is only a fraction of the decisions that many of you have to make on a daily basis, whether it's on the admin side or things you're contending with as a Board. And so know that that's something that we will consider and adapt to suit your needs. Now, you've heard a little bit about us having a team approach. There's just three of us here before you today, but there's a pool of 64, and that's worth emphasizing because when it's that 6 a.m. call or that middle-of-the-night email, when you get that prompt response, you really benefit from the value of the brain trust. Right? And that means that we're keeping costs low. We're getting you an answer as quickly as possible. And we're calling upon the collective experience of decades, decades of school law experience. And that's something we bring, one stop shop. You'll see that we have sort of a bifurcated support. We can work directly with administration to assess and advise any of the legal issues as they come across your desk. And we also offer, as you know, board council services to assist and guide the board with issues of governance and legal compliance. This is essential given the changes to all of the legislation that happened this year. So when you call upon the 64, you're calling upon all of us to step up and help you answer your challenge. Leandra? Ms. Ortiz stated, so your primary attorney contacts will be those that you see up above. That's myself, Ms. Gessing, Ms. Rodriguez, and Elvin Houston, who is our Special Education Attorney, one of many in our office. And just want to point out that we just feel that it's important to note that we have been doing school law and only school law as a firm for 40 plus years now. Jim Walsh is well known nationally. Our special education group is well known nationally. We are also working in the areas now, have expanded into the areas of immigration, and that's a national aspect as well. And just know that we are uniquely qualified to help Brownsville ISD. I think that my colleagues have said it best by saying we're a one-stop shop. You can come to us, you can ask us. We also collaborate with our other 64 attorneys. We do have an internal email listserv. So if you are sending something at 1 in the morning, there's probably somebody up that we can all email together. And next thing you know, we'll get five, six, sadly, 7, 8, 9 responses at that late at night or early in the morning. But at the end of the day, we are here to serve the district and to serve the Board. So, we believe that we are uniquely qualified and that we would make a difference in all of the Brownsville ISD offers to its staff and students. We're done.

Ms. Minerva Pena, Board Member stated, thank you good evening. How long and how many years have you been working with school law and regulations in your firm? Ms. Ortiz replied, with the school, well, the firm itself has been in existence for 40 years. Individually, I can tell you that

I have now on my 21st year of practice for school law, was about four years here at Brownsville ISD, and then have been already serving 11 years. So almost 15, 16 years for myself. And we have several years-experience here as well. Ms. Pena stated, question, you said 21, so you have 21? Ms. Ortiz stated, total years as a practicing attorney, yes, ma'am. Not just school law, school law, I said 15. Ms. Pena interjected, my question is specific. Ms. Ortiz stated, yes, ma'am. Ms. Pena continued, let me repeat the question again? How many years have you been doing school law and regulations as an attorney? Ms. Ortiz stated, how many years have I personally been doing school law? Ms. Pena stated, yes. Ms. Ortiz continued, yes, ma'am, Leanne Ortiz, I've been doing school law for the last 15 years, ma'am. Thank you. Ms. Pena stated, and may I ask your partners a question? Ms. Gessing stated, I have been practicing law for five years. Ms. Pena stated, can you get on the mic, please? Ms. Gessing repeated, myself, I've been practicing in school law for five years. Ms. Pena stated, thank you. Ms. Rodriguez stated, I am new to the firm, but I've been practicing anti-discrimination law for about three years, so four years total in this general arena, and I've been an attorney for 14 years. Ms. Pena stated, and how many in school law and regulation specifically? Ms. Rodriguez stated, school law specifically, about six months. Ms. Pena stated, no, my second question. What attracted you to come and apply as a BISD Board Attorney? Ms. Ortiz stated, our attraction, yes, our attraction is that we are a law firm that serves school districts across the state of Texas. Brownsville ISD is a premier school district in our county, in our area. We do have a local office. We are interested in helping you do what you do best, which is serving students. And that's our mission, and that's our goal, and that's why we make sure that we attempt to let you know what our services are so that you can make the decision that you need to make and if it's us, we're happy to serve. Yes, ma'am.

Mr. Carlos Elizondo, Board Member stated, I have no questions, ma'am. Thank you.

Ms. Neida Ruth Grantland, Board Member stated, thank you for your presentation. My question is, is Board development training a part of what you're offering to us, or a part of your services? Ms. Ortiz stated, so, Board development training, yes, ma'am. We are one of the firms where every single one of our attorneys is individually certified to offer board training, which is required by TEA. It used to be that it could just be the firm, and now it has to be an individual attorney under the new law. And so, we have made sure that every single one of our attorneys has that certification. So, yes, ma'am, we would be able to serve you. Ms. Grantland stated, thank you.

Ms. Daniella Lopez Valdez, Board President stated, my first question is for evaluation of your litigation experience, can you identify three cases you personally tried from beginning compliance stage through to a jury verdict and summarize involvements? Ms. Ortiz replied, Yes I can so, I will say I've had a federal jury trial that went all the way through the selection of the jury and cross-examination, we ended up getting a directed verdict, which means that we didn't have to go through putting on our side of the case, and so that was a federal court case at San Benito that we did for them, and we were successful with that trial. I was personally a part of that trial. I also was personally a part of the trial for Brownsville ISD. It was a lawsuit, I believe the name of the defendant was Michael Alex. And we were successful and were able to get a verdict in favor of the district during that trial. We also, again, I know you're asking for me personally, but we also have 64 attorneys. We have a vast litigation group, and I know that they have had, just in the last few months or few years, we've had several Title IX cases that have gone to trial. I believe one in August of 2024, a Title IX case that has gone to trial. So,

if there's a specific type of case, we'll make sure that the right litigator is on that case. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, thank you. And the question was for the firm in general. So thank you. Ms. Ortiz stated, I was like, I tried to give you my personal, but it's been a bit. Yes. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, thank you, and then my second question is, given the current legal landscape in Texas, rising challenges in special education, increased political scrutiny of school Boards, TEA interventions, curriculum departments, and heightened public record demands, how does your firm specifically prepare and protect districts to navigate these pressures while keeping governance stable and student focused. Ms. Gessing stated, we have a very multifaceted approach when it comes to the items that you just referenced. One beautiful thing about our firm is that we have a retainer program where you are able to contact our attorneys at no cost in addition to your retainer fee per year, and those are considered no-charge retainer phone calls. So if there is some legislation or some guidance that you've been given or political scrutiny that you've received from the community, you can contact one of our attorneys and we can provide you on-the-spot resources and advice. Another very, very important item that our firm offers is we do provide frequent email blasts to our clients that keeps them up to date on legal standards. legislative changes, federal guidance. And finally, and I always mention this just because it was something I did when I first joined the firm, every time that we have a legislative session, we have attorneys that are devoted to the legislative session itself, and that involves tracking bills from start to finish, not only including those that are fully enrolled, but also those that have tracked and failed at different levels. So that way we can keep you apprised of every change that we have as it moves, and this also includes subsequent special sessions. So these are all items that are available to you on top of the 64 attorney brain trust that we also offer for consultation calls and general advice. Ms. Rodriguez stated, if I could add another perk is the firm has a robust relationship with the agencies that are interpreting these new laws, TEA, TASB, and not only that, because of the breadth and scope of our client base, we have seen how some of these new laws are playing out and some of the challenges other districts are facing and the solutions as well. You get all of that when you connect with us, and that's how we equip districts to respond to the issues at hand.

Mr. Frank Ortiz, Board Member stated, I have two questions. Question number one, how would you determine when the district should settle a case versus litigating it? Ms. Ortiz stated, well, as a litigator, one of the litigators of the firm, one of the things we have to do early on is work with your administration or review the facts of the case to see if there's any area or facet in which we would basically want to move forward to litigation. So we would evaluate the case based on the risk or the liability of the district, potentially, and then we would bring that evaluation forward and make sure that that's something that you understand as a board, because ultimately it would be the board's decision whether to resolve or to settle a matter with our guidance. Mr. Ortiz stated, okay, my second question. Can you describe a time when you prevented a board from making a costly legal mistake? Ms. Gessing stated, so I primarily work in construction. And as y'all are aware, recently there have been numerous tariff hikes, construction defect litigation. the list goes on, and so whenever I advise a district in terms of which procurement method that they choose to use and how to tailor that procurement to serve the best interest of the district and overall the taxpayers money that our bonds are apprised of I always try to list for them the potential risks associated with those, so I recently had a board that went out for a very, very large bond that did thankfully pass, and when making a decision as to which procurement method would serve them the best in terms of cost management, project management, having enough boots on the ground to manage to ultimately lead to cost savings. I believe by recommending to them the construction manager

at risk constructed delivery method actually did result in a large amount of savings to them. We were also able to advise them on the back end when they were submitted their overall cost proposal from their contract. from their contractor of numerous deficiencies in which that accounting did not align with the contract, therefore preventing the contractor from double billing the district for work that it performed more than once on that sheet. So that is the most recent one that I have where we were able to save the district money and also save them from approving something that was not in accordance with their contract. Mr. Ortiz stated, thank you very much. Ms. Rodriguez stated, I mentioned a moment ago I have some anti-discrimination experience, and I was part of a group that advised a district to better understand the nuance of following the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. And so sometimes something may seem common sense, but the intricacies of what is expected and what federal agencies expect municipalities to do requires a close assessment. And we were able to have a meaningful conversation about the facts at hand and the solutions that were district -centric and kid-centric. And I think everyone was able to reach a resolution that didn't end up in a federal charge of discrimination.

Ms. Denise Garza, Board Member stated, I have two questions. Have you previously outsourced portions of your legal work to other firms, consultants, or vendors? Please provide examples, and why would you need to outsource work? Ms. Ortiz stated, so as we had expressed earlier, the law firm of Walsh-Gallegos is pretty much a one-stop shop. We don't try to outsource anything. However, there are situations such as conflicts that might arise where we may be required or we may advise the board that it's best to obtain perhaps like a third-party investigator because there might be some sort of conflict of interest, not with the firm, but just basically within that would make it difficult for us to give guidance to the board and to the administration at the same time. Although we are legally permitted to do that, there just might be some situations where we might have to go out for like an independent investigation or for expert situations, but we do try to use your actual staff and administrators as experts. We designate them as experts in our litigation disclosures all the time because you are. You are the experts for education and for your school district and so we can if we can utilize that and save the district money we do use that method as well. Ms. Garza stated, and my last question. Describe your process for outsourcing legal work. Will the Board have the opportunity to review and approve any outsourcing prior? And how are additional costs being communicated and managed between the firm and board? Ms. Gessing stated, do you mind if I take a quick second to go back to your previous question? Ms. Garza stated yes. Ms. Gessing stated, just briefly I just wanted to Bounce off of what Leandro just mentioned about conflicts of interest. I think that one thing that we really do pride ourselves at our firm is that we are school law, and that's all we do is school law. And so when we get into situations of conflict of interest, we feel that we really do preserve. our integrity and our ethical guidance when it comes to that, and that we do not represent cities, we do not represent state agencies, teachers, teachers associations, we are fully indebted to school districts themselves, so those issues that do come up with conflicts of interest in which a city is now at odds with a school district, we never have those types of conflicts of interest, and we do everything that we can to avoid those by solely sticking with school districts. Ms. Garza stated, thank you. Ms. Gessing stated, yes, and I'll let Leandra fill in on the outsourcing. Ms. Ortiz stated, okay, so yes, ma 'am the outsourcing any type of outsourcing would have to be authorized by the Board Especially because your Board policy does require that any law firm that is hired by the Board Any law firm that is hired to do services for the school district must come from the Board. So we would not be able to bring in any outside law firm Without your approval.

Ms. Jessica Gonzalez, Board Member stated, I have a two in one question. So how often do you anticipate needing to outsource work and what safeguards do you have in place to prevent unexpected or escalating costs to the district? Ms. Rodriguez replied, we typically do not anticipate outsourcing legal work. Again, under the unique circumstance that there might be a conflict of interest. To the extent you're involved in litigation with our firm, for example, we represent you on a contentious or complex matter. You can count on the firm to keep the client, you, updated on how the case is progressing. We work closely to provide status reports in addition to contemporaneous correspondence on the developments. And to the extent decisions need to be made about strategy or about assessing a risk, right, because a case looks one way at the very beginning, but through discovery and potentially through mediation, there are other considerations. And so, we would work with you to assess whether or not proceeding forward makes sense and whether these are dollars that you want to spend. So, there's a lot of communication in that regard.

- B. Ranking/Evaluation criteria established in RFQ #26-131 for Board Legal Advisory Services, the Board of Trustees will review and rank all submissions, including the firms' presentations.

Ms. Rosario Pena, Director of Procurement Services stated, Madam Chair, now we move over into the ranking portion of the solicitation and I'm going to go again through the steps to follow like we did last time. Each Board Member received the submissions and the associated ranking criteria in advance of the evaluation so that to support an efficient review process and ensure understanding of all the materials provided. During the evaluation communication among board members should be limited to asking questions that clarify the proposals and enhance the understanding of their contents and requirements. Before evaluating and ranking the solicitations, each board member must sign a nondisclosure statement to safeguard the confidentiality and integrity of the evaluation process that is found in your binders under tab six. The evaluation and ranking must be conducted using the scoring matrix and criteria outlined in the solicitation document, otherwise known as the scope of work under tab number three, page nine. Evaluation and ranking of solicitations will be based exclusively on qualifications according to the published ranking criteria. Discussions regarding pricing or fees are not allowed at this time. Each board member has been issued three ranking criteria sheets, one for each submission under tab number seven. The ranking criteria has five major areas of evaluation, and each area has been assigned a determined maximum point value. An analysis of firm qualifications has been prepared for the submissions to provide an accessible comparison to the participating firms. I'm sorry, and that's under tab number four. As requested by the board, reference checks were conducted by the Office of the Staff Attorney and shared with the Board of Trustees prior to this meeting. Following established procurement procedures, once the board members have completed their rankings, the ranking sheets will be collected and tabulated by board member. And this is a change from last night. this is only following what we did four and a half years ago when we selected the firm. Following the same ranking process used in the previous selection of board legal advisory services, board members have been provided or will be provided here in a minute an additional ranking sheet to indicate their firm preference by assigning a one, two or three. The Board President will collect the completed sheets and make the motion based on this final ranking step. Once the Board of Trustees approves a selected service provider, the district will begin contract negotiations to define the scope of services, establish fees, and finalize all required contract terms. The finalized negotiated contract will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at a future meeting date.

Madam Chair, if you would like to recess. Ms. Lopez Valdez stated, thank you, Ms. Pena. We will now recess and rank our sheets and come back right after

Recess: 8:02 p.m.
Board Reconvenes: 8:25 p.m.

The Board may deliberate or take action regarding the following agenda items.

Board policy BE (Local) and Robert's Rules limits debate to two opportunities. A Trustee may debate a motion for two minutes on the first speaking opportunity and one minute on the second opportunity.

Resume Order of the Day

B. Recommend approval of the following Bids/Proposals(s):

1. Discussion, consideration and possible action to recommend awarding RFQ #26-131 Board Legal Advisory Services.

Motion made by Daniella Lopez Valdez, seconded by Denise Garza, to recommend awarding RFQ #26-131, Board Legal Advisory services to O’Hanlon, Demerath, and Castillo, PC.

The following vote was recorded

Yea:	Ms. Lopez, Ms. Garza, Ms. Gonzalez, Ms. Grantland
Nay:	Mr. Elizondo, Mr. Ortiz
Abstain:	Ms. Pena

Motion Carried: 4-2-1

IX. Announcement(s):

X. Adjournment.

Motion was made by Daniella Lopez Valdez, seconded by Jessica Gonzalez, and unanimously carried to approve to adjourn the Special Called Board Meeting at 8:26 p.m. P.M. (7-0-0)

➤ **There being no further business appearing before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.**

(HANDOUTS ADDED TO OFFICIAL MINUTES)

(AUDIO/VIDEO TAPES OF THE OPEN MEETING AND THE WRITTEN CERTIFIED AGENDA OF THE CLOSED MEETING ARE ON FILE)

Approved by:

Daniella Lopez Valdez, President of the Board

Date

Attested by:

Minerva Pena, Secretary of the Board

Date

Notes: Font style designation

Board of Trustees

Administration

Board Attorney

Staff Attorney

Speaker/Presenter

(Minutes presented at Regular Board Meeting held on April 7, 2026)