



City Council Special Meeting
Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

The Special City Council Meeting of the City of Montgomery was called to order by Mayor Countryman at 5:00 p.m. on November 18, 2024, at City Hall 101 Old Plantersville Rd., Montgomery, TX and live video streaming.

With Council Members present a quorum was established.

Present: Mayor Sara Countryman
Mayor Pro-Tem Casey Olson
Council Member Place 1 Carol Langley
Council Member Place 4 Cheryl Fox
Council Member Place 5 Stan Donaldson

INVOCATION

Council Member Donaldson led the invocation.

PLEDGES OF ALLEGIANCE

Council Member Donaldson led the Pledge of Allegiance and Pledge of Allegiance to the Texas State Flag.

PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Countryman read citizen email correspondence as follows:

James Greene:

Dear Mayor Countryman,

I am writing this statement explaining my decision to leave employment with the City of Montgomery, Texas for the record.

On Monday, July 29, 2024, at approximately 5:00 p.m., I was having a conversation with Maryann Carl in her office. Gary Palmer was on his way past her office on his way out, and I remember needing to ask him a question. While he and I were speaking, I noticed that he had a USMC (United States Marine Corps) tattoo on his arm. I said, "that's cute Gary." He said, "yeah, you wish you had one." I said, "no, I think I am ok," and I laughed. He then abruptly left.

I arrived to work the next morning, July 30, 2024, at approximately 8 a.m. Palmer was parked in the parking spot that I typically park in. This was unusual for two reasons: (1) he typically parks in the gravel lot behind the row of police vehicles; and (2) I rarely ever saw him in the office prior to 10 a.m. When I went to my office, I found a sticky note on my door that said, "Come see me. -gp." When I went to his office, he told me to close the door and have a seat. I asked him what's up, and he told me: "I am not your fucking buddy, and I am not your fucking friend." He went on to explain that I was unprofessional and it was not ok for me to act like that especially around his subordinates (referring to Patricia Campuzano who was in her office adjacent to us.) He then lectured me for a while and told me that I was still in my probationary period and asked what I had to say. I apologized to him and said that it would not happen again. He then went on for a while again about the same topic and again asked me what I had to say. I told him, "I already said it Gary, it won't happen again." He then released me to go back to work and I went back to my office.

I reflected on the incident for a while and ended up taking an early lunch. I called my wife and discussed with her what happened and she and I both agreed that it was not a healthy work environment. My specific reasoning behind the decision to leave are as follows:

- 1. I am an Army veteran of 9 years. I have never interacted with another service member either during active duty or after my service and bantered about the other branches of service. When I met Gary for the first time at my interview for the City Secretary Position, he noted that I was a veteran and that he had served in the Marine Corps. I told him then and there that "nobody is perfect," to which he laughed. I will continue to banter with other branches of service regardless of their position as either a subordinate or supervisor of mine. This is an important and well-known part of the camaraderie between the branches of service whether active duty or not. I could understand being upset if I were criticizing his actions as the City Administrator, however, this was clearly not the case.*
- 2. The way Gary handled this entire situation was at a minimum unprofessional. First, I believe that he purposefully parked in the spot that I usually parked in to send some kind of message of intimidation and power. Second, the way that he spoke to me was uncalled for and unnecessary. His behavior was weird and unsettling and I felt that was an indication of how his behavior would continue during my employment, something that I am clearly not interested in dealing with.*
- 3. I have never in my working career (twenty-seven years) had a supervisor threaten my job. I found it interesting that he even communicated that to me as he actually does not have the authority to fire the City Secretary. With that being said, the city has much more invested in the City Administrator than the City Secretary, and I am not interested in working in the toxic environment that he was creating and the potential of him influencing Councilmembers.*

When I returned from lunch, I went to Palmer's office and explained pretty much what I have written here. He asked me if I was going to give him notice and I told him that I was not. I told him that probationary periods work both ways, and I had decided that is in my best interest to leave immediately. He told me that if I changed my mind to let him know.

I left the City of Madisonville with the intention of gaining experience in the role of Director of Administrative Services as well as the continuation of my experience as the Secretary. In my case, I took a major risk in leaving the City of Madisonville. I left a job that was secure as well as a short fifteen minute commute from my home. Up to that day, I had zero intentions of leaving the City of Montgomery. Had the environment been different, I would likely still be in that role. Whatever the cost to me personally or professionally, I will not work for or around Gary Palmer.

Mayor, thank you very much for your confidence and the opportunity to serve the City of Montgomery, no matter how briefly. I am happy to know you, the Council, and the staff at the city. I continue to believe that the City of Montgomery has a very bright future and I look forward to hearing great news about its growth.

Meagan Tuttle:

Dear Mayor and Council members,

As much as I would like to be at the council meeting tonight, due to my work schedule, I don't think I will be able to attend. However, I thought it was important to share my thoughts with you all regarding some of the agenda topics.

Let me start by mentioning, I have watched EVERY council meeting since the city started streaming the meetings 4 + years ago. I have watched as the people in the council seats have changed, I have followed along in the agenda packet as items have been discussed, and researched ordinances to get the full picture of what the city standards are.

After many years of watching, I'm disheartened by the fact that we don't seem to be making really any progress. It seems like these meetings keep circling around the same topics over and over again. We are wasting time and effort on trivial issues instead of focusing on topics that really matter.

I have seen in multiple meetings, Council target city staff for what seems to be personal aim or retaliation for a staff member having a differing opinion. We have been down this road before with the Assistant City Administrator, I watched it play out. I don't think it is wise to go down this road again, and I don't think there is another person who has as much knowledge and history about the city of Montgomery as Mr. McCorquodale.

In regard to the City administrator position, you have already voted not to renew his contract. Terminating immediately does nothing but leave a gap for other staff members to try to fill in and cost the city additional money. (roughly \$19,000 if my calculations are correct) Not to mention, we have barely even gotten the City Secretary spot filled. If you terminate the City Administrator and Assistant City Admin are each of you planning on coming up here to train the new secretary?

*Before you go into the meeting tonight, I'd challenge each of you to reflect and think:
Why did I want to join city council?*

*What did I intend to accomplish by holding this position?
and then flash forward to current day and think:*

Am I accomplishing what I set out to do?

What does my resume of accomplishments look like while I've been on council?

Are my actions based on my personal feelings towards individuals and/or discussion topics? Or are they REALLY in the best interest of my community?

Final, unrelated thought- Why haven't we appointed a 5th council member after 6 months?

We are asking for trouble by not having someone in that 5th spot and relying on the mayor to be the tiebreaker should we need one. I feel THIS should be a priority topic.

I appreciate you all taking the time to read this, and I truly thank you all for the time and dedication you are putting into this city. I recognize this is not an easy position to hold and I applaud you all.

This email needs no response, consider it my "public forum" comment, although I am surely over my 3 minute limit.

Phillip Lefevre, 19971 FM 2854, addressed the Council. This whole issue basically started over private versus public roads and I think it's important that people realize that you cannot have a public road that then goes private, but you can have a private that goes public so long as it is being built properly to standards and to the city ordinances. In this case, the homeowners, and I think this is the homeowners, are the ones that should be given the consideration on whether they wanted to have the roads go public again. Personally, I'd keep them private because you can lock the gates, and you can keep bad people out. Generally, in the long run, homes on private roads are worth more money, but it's their choice and they wanted to do it and I respect that. So, these roads were built with that opportunity in mind, and it's taken the homeowners almost a year if I'm not mistaken to get any support from the City. The City should have known, did know, that these roads were done properly. Mr. McCorquodale was on City Council and signed off on two of these subdivisions being passed. He was in meetings with us we had disputed engineering invoices from Jones and Carter he was in meetings with us when we went over those with Jones and Carter and actually got refunds for ourselves and the City. Mr. Roznovsky was with Jones and Carter, he was in meetings, he knew that these roads had been inspected and checked. There is not much you can say when all of a sudden you get a full court press and four City people come up and basically say substandard, not to grade, do not take them over. That is basically saying you are in an inferior location. Your houses are worth less and we the City are not going to help you. When the reality was when you look at all the facts, they knew that the City roads have been inspected. They kept quiet. If you look at the tape they basically tried to misinform Council. They knew Mr. Finke had already shown that the roads had tested, the concrete had been tested, and actually the test brakes were much stronger than they needed to be. They basically almost kept that from Council. It was only at the last minute that that was produced and their whole intention was for Council to refuse to take their advice and refuse to accept the roads and that would accord a big fuss. I think it was a big shock to them because it's normal for councils to accept the advice of staff that's what paid to do and it's not a rubber stamp but generally if you have employees and they're qualified, you trust and it's really great and it is a credit to council that council having also received those concrete tests elected not to take their advice and elected to have the roads come back into the city. Council was basically looking after the city people the people who work for the city were ignoring. So when you come down to it, and I will finish quickly, you've got the takes and you've got them aligning the homes and the people in the basically how they live you have now got Hillary has

already read all of the many emails she's going to read you some more tonight and then you have basically a situation where they have created something that is very unfortunate and to me the worst thing and the most unforgivable thing is they were using homeowners to basically get to us and or to get at the city. Thank you.

Michael Ciaccio, 138 Anna Springs Lane, addressed the Council. The agenda tells us City Council is here to rule on the careers of two sitting City Administrators one of whom risked his life to protect us and he is an honorably discharged United States Army Veteran. Thank you for your service to our nation. I salute you. Before we focus on the City Administrators, the ones that are being looked at, let us turn that lens and focus on the City Council. Let us take a deeper look. Let us talk about personal bankruptcy. Is there a member of City Council currently going into bankruptcy? Has the City Council shared that bankruptcy with voters. My whole thrust is going to be not something like the bankruptcy but was it shared with the voters so the Texas voters walk into the knowledge. If one cannot manage one's finances how or why can one be trusted to manage a driving municipality. Carol, Casey, Cheryl, Stan did you communicate the City Council Members personal bankruptcy with the voters, the bad judgment on City Council that never makes it for the voting. Driving while intoxicated and I've done it. I was not arrested you know why. I got behind the wheel I was scared to death, drove real slow and followed people so you got to make two mistakes You got to be foolish enough to drink too much and then get in the car and create another crime driving. Is there a City Council Member with a DWI conviction? Has the City Council communicated and that it is not so much that the DWI happened, but was it communicated to the voters. Communicated to the DWI convictions. Carol, Casey, Cheryl, Stan did you communicate the DWI to voters so when they walk into the booth they know who and what they are voting for. Pedophile endorsements. Has any sitting Montgomery City Council Member received multiple endorsements from Mark Wayne Shorton 63 of Splendora who was found guilty of continuous sexual abuse of a child under the age of 14. Carol, Casey, Cheryl, Stan, did you communicate those endorsements to the voters. Again, the fact that somebody endorsed somebody not my point, not a big deal but was the voting public informed so they walk into the booth and they know what they were doing. Summary, bankrupt while in a lucrative space software engineering software sales. Think about that bank and information technology today's day and age. DWI, children put at risk, the voters never know endorsed by a child predator. Voters never know Carol, Casey, Cheryl, Stan. If you do not fix it I will. Dave thanks again for your service to our nation.

Hilliary Dumas, 8560 Majestic Lake Ct., addressed the Council. After last week's public comment, I went home and finished watching the City Council meeting at home on video. The video is really glitchy by the way so I hope in the future we can fix that but after the meeting adjourned the video still running, Mr. McCorquodale was speaking to Council Member Casey Olsen and although the audio is bad it is clear he is still implying and backing up staff that our information was incorrect in defending city actions. So, tonight I am going to give you the facts not from me, not from city staff, but from Jones and Carter and invoicing directly. Here is a copy of the invoices (handout provided to City Council Members) from Jones and Carter line by line for section two of Lake Creek Village. I have the same for section three if you would like. If you look at the tabbed pieces, the first one we have talked about. The City was involved in meetings and preconstruction, but if you start at page four (4) it talks about we are billed for plan review email about private streets and private drainage. Okay it mean does not necessarily mean that much. Go to page seven (7), I'm

sorry six (6) where billed for a call from Roan RE: paving, a call from Troy Tolen who was our engineer at the time of final inspection and paving. Page seven (7) we are billed multiple times rebar inspection site visit 1:00 am concrete pour, rebar inspection, concrete pour finishing rebar inspection, filling behind back of curb. If you continue on to page eight (8), you will see that it continues, introduction to site, inspection of road, discussion concerning pavement, scheduled pavement inspection, review of paving areas. So you can see throughout this document, the \$13,000 we paid Jones and Carter for section two alone, there are numerous instances and it is very clear they were involved at each step of the way. This was not done in secret; this was not done without City knowledge. This was done hand in hand. The last thing you will see is another email because I am sure you enjoyed my highlights last week. An email from our contractor to Jones and Carter regarding Lake Creek Village section two concrete paving cast will be out there for inspection. So, I hope this puts an end and without beating a dead horse everybody can clearly see that these were done with the city that everything done in the city requires inspecting, testing, and oversight. A private house requires a soil for a slab the same with the roads even though the roads were platted as private, they still require the same testing, the same inspection, the same process. If you will look at the cover you will see highlighted at the top Client Manager Ed Shackelford, Project Manager Chris Roznovsky. To be transparent, unlike city staff was about this project or us. Chris Roznovsky was not the engineer at the time, it was Glenn Fleming. This printout was done after the fact, so Chris should have never been commenting or stating with fact that he was specifically told not to inspect the roads because quite clearly the facts show otherwise. Thank you.

SPECIAL AGENDA

1. Consideration and possible action on the employment contract between the city administrator and the City of Montgomery.

Gary Palmer addressed the Council and stated in a matter of three (3) days we went from “*do you plan to move your family to Texas*” to voting not to renew my contract to now, attempting to terminate me for cause. No notice. No discussion. Three (3) days.

In the 20 months I have been your City Administrator, I have had numerous conversations with each of you. None of them were negative or unproductive conversations. No unsolvable issue ever came up and I have done my best for you during that time.

My perception of our work was that we were getting stuff done and tracking positively on our identified priorities. I was blindsided when without notice or explanation, my employment contract was put on the Tuesday November 12th agenda for discussion.

When the item came up for discussion at Tuesday’s meeting the only question I received was a personal one, not one related to my job: “*Are you planning to move your family to Texas?*” I answered honestly “*I told you I did not know*” and that was the truth.

Without any further discussion or notice to me, five (5) minutes later when we were back in the regular meeting, the motion was made to “not renew the City Administrator’s

contract” which passed again without any discussion. This was a formal and binding decision by the City Council. After that motion passed, I asked the Council about the notice requirement, my last day with the City, and severance payout in which the Mayor and Council Members responded in the affirmative. The City attorney also asked about the contract provisions in which he was told to follow the contract. It was also stated that no one had a copy of my contract even though it was on the agenda for discussion. This was Tuesday evening November 12, 2024 at around 7:30 pm and you can view it and hear it on the meeting video.

After the meeting at around 9:00 p.m. that same evening I and the City Attorney received an email from the Mayor requesting to add my contract again to an agenda. Add the termination of the Assistant City Administrator to the agenda and then add the appointment of an interim City Administrator.

Two days later still hearing nothing from anybody, I had to track down the City Attorney who informed me the City Council is now wanting to terminate me for cause. This was Thursday, two days after the meeting, maybe a day and a half.

It appears to me that Council did not like the “I do not know” response I gave when asked if I was going to move my family to Texas. It also seems to me the immediate decision to “not renew my contract” last Tuesday was either a preplanned or an arbitrary and capricious decision. I do not believe the Council understood that the City voting not renew my contract would kick in the severance requirement. After the meeting when you realized this, you came up with a plan to just throw it back on the agenda tonight and do it again but this time add “for cause” which gets you out of having to pay the severance. And why not? It puts the burden on me to now have to sue the City which will then take it out of your hands and put it in the hands of the Texas Municipal League. This relieves you all from owning your actions, admitting to any mistakes, and any settlement will likely be paid by the Texas Municipal League. Who cares if it ruins my name and reputation in the process? Who cares if it damages me and my family financially. Who cares it is not your money; it is City money.

1. You already all voted not renew my contract on Tuesday. You cannot arbitrarily change your mind because you did not understand the impact of your decision.
2. I was not provided any reason or notice for “the cause”.
3. Our contract specifically defines the reasons you can terminate me “for cause”.
4. If I acted in any way that reached the level of “cause” as defined in our contract I should have been immediately suspended pending an investigation.

This toxicity at the leadership level spreads like a virus throughout your organization. What do you think your actions are doing to the psychology of your employees here, your city workers? Watching your City Council arbitrarily dismiss the City Administrator on a whim who has a contract and they do not. How do you think they believe they will be treated? It is telling them either bow and kiss the ring or you will get tossed out. It will turn your organization into survival, your city services will tank, and you will lose the confidence of your community. It is a downward spiral from there.

What do you think your next City Administrator is going to be like knowing he/she has to try to manage while taking grenades with their back against the wall. Are you going to honor their contract. What business is going to want to come to the City of Montgomery and plant roots when they see this kind of venomous conflict going on in the city in which they plan to invest. What outside agency is ever going to respect and take a city seriously that is behaving like this?

I took this job and moved out here based on our contract. I made sacrifices and rearranged my life and the life of my family based on our contract. I made many life altering decisions based on our contract. I would not have accepted this job and moved here had the city not agreed to the terms of that contract. I upheld my end of the agreement. I honored the contract. Be honorable people and do the same.

I have had no performance issues, you have no cause, I have done nothing wrong, and you all know it. I am owed nine (9) months of salary in accordance with our contract. If it's not paid out I have retained legal counsel and immediately intend on suing the City for breach. I am not going anywhere.

Councilmember Olson said he agrees with Gary Palmer 100 percent. He said here is the problem. We have had many conversations about your contract. I helped Caleb write that contract and we went back and forth lots and lots so he is very well aware what is in it. He agrees 100 percent that he is not going to let an ego or emotional decision damage his reputation and we should not allow it to damage the City of Montgomery's reputation. If we sign a contract with someone and you have not read it you need to read it again. It states exactly what causes for and we did none of those things to provide him those causes. He tried to tell Council and they all argued with him on numerous occasions. There is no cause. He has done everything we have asked him to do, end of story. We follow a contract. When I put my name on a line I am going to honor that. End of story. If anybody here thinks their ego is better than their word you need to go somewhere else. Resign, do something else. Councilmember Fox asked Councilmember Olson if he helped author the contract. Councilmember Olson said you bet. Councilmember Olson asked Caleb Villarreal, City Attorney how many emails did we go back and forth on that contract. Caleb Villarreal said it was several emails. Councilmember Fox said she was not aware of that. Councilmember Olson said back and forth to make sure that they got certain things that were left out of the last contract captured. He said when it comes to my integrity, the integrity of this town, if we make an agreement with someone we better uphold it. To sit back and say oh well we do not want to pay it because we do not like this person, I'm sorry but that is not right. Councilmember Fox said but you are wrong Casey. Councilmember Olson said no I am not wrong. He said that contract is iron clad and we did nothing to inform him of anything. Councilmember Fox said she likes Gary. Councilmember Olson said he is just very, very disappointed that this is even on this agenda and if Alan was here he could read my text messages when I said this was totally wrong and it should not be on the agenda.

Mayor Countryman said Alan told her today I agree with the best result for the City and this is the best result. There are two reasons why the contract was breached and I guess we will talk about that in court. Actually there are a number of reasons, but Alan said two for sure. One is under item two and the addendum. Mayor Countryman said that is all she will say.

Councilmember Donaldson said he is going to speak up for himself. He said he has no ego involved in this situation and has no interest in it either financially or otherwise. I am just trying to do the right thing for the City and sometimes it is a blurry picture of what we have to deal with on a day-to-day basis. He said just like Gary said in an email to them he does not have any personal anything against anybody on Council but by the same token we do not, at least him personally, this is not an issue of emotion, it is not an issue of trying to get back at somebody. He has no ulterior motive. He just wants the City to move forward, wants it to move functionally, and there are a lot of other instances involved which they cannot really discuss right now because this is not a forum to bring out dirty trash. This is a forum to do business and if they see the direction that the leadership is going is not in our best interest then they have a right to say no it has to turn and go another way. He said there is a lot of undercurrent he knows from the time he got here to now and the time that he has observed the Council there is a lot of bickering, a lot of personal animosity, and a lot of hate. We cannot have that and at some point in time we have to find a way to find medium ground. We have to learn to respect each other's opinion and we have to learn to forgive, but people do not seem to want to do that. They want to take it to the next level and this is the next level. He said I am sorry it does not look good. It is going to look ugly, that is the way it goes down when things are not going right. When you are disrespected, which he cannot go into but this Council has been disrespected by the City and things have been going on undercover without them knowing it and if they had not brought it to light through this procedure they would never know about it because there was a gag order on them and that is the way it is. If you are going to elect us then you are going to respect us and let us make our own opinion and own decisions. They are not here to play games. He is not here to play games. He said he is sorry but they have to take action in what they perceive is the best interest of the City. Councilmember Donaldson said he likes Dave; he loves his service and he is a good man but he crossed the line and they cannot have people that cross the line get away with it. People have to be punished when they do something out of the ordinary and make extenuating steps to make a personal attack on somebody. We cannot have that. He said he does not care what anyone says. Right is right and wrong is wrong. There is a right way to do things and a wrong way and nobody seems to want to do the right way. He said he is sorry they have to do it this way. He hates it and he does not like it either. He does not like it any more than Gary does. We have to find some way where we can get along and if it takes moving people out for whatever reason then they are going to do it. I am sorry but we are going to do it. He said he does not like the process, he wishes they would have handled it better and he apologizes to the people here and the people in the City. Yes, it is going to make them look bad, he cannot help that. They have to do what they feel is right. There are two sides to every story and they have their side. Right now it looks like they are going to stick with it.

Councilmember Fox said since everyone is having this open conversation with Casey starting it she does apologize also. She said I have lived here for 50 years and has never seen quite this much but there have been things that have been breached that she feels is absolutely irreparable. She said one of the things and she does like Gary but he sent Council a letter on June 5th that said he does not feel he is successful in this City. She said actually I am a grandmother so I can say this, he was actually telling me my child was ugly and I have lived here for 50 years. She does not understand why he could not be successful so she kind of brought it on to the fact that at this point if he was not successful why were they spending so much money in the City, so maybe they just needed to move forward. She said she does apologize herself and hopes everyone understands.

Councilmember Olson said he would like to make the comment it is not open consent he commented on agenda item one as it was all about his contract and that is all he talked about. He said it is not open discussion.

Motion: Council Member Langley made a motion to terminate the City Administrator for cause effective immediately. Council Member Fox seconded the motion.

Councilmember Olson asked if this is a debate, somebody name the cause for him. Mayor Countryman said she believes there is going to be a lawsuit and per Alan he asked that they not state this. Councilmember Fox said Alan said not to discuss it. Councilmember Olson said this is what he does not understand. Everyone here has been privy to Alan's comments on what to do with this except for him and he has not missed an executive session. He said they did not talk about it then. Mayor Countryman said you are always able to call the City Attorney. Councilmember Olson said here is the thing people and asked what happened outside of this building. Councilmember Fox asked what are you saying Casey. Councilmember Olson said there is a whole lot of information that is not being shared and everybody has it. Mayor Countryman said you have it and you have been on the emails. Councilmember Olson said no he has not. He has been on the email from you to Gary and back but he has no information from Alan. Mayor Countryman said well she called Alan. Councilmember Casey Olson asked how did everyone else get the information from Alan on what to do and whether or not they should name the cause because if there is cause he would by all sure like to hear what it is because this contract is very specific on what is cause. Councilmember Fox said you will have the opportunity to vote. Councilmember Olson said he has the opportunity to vote but this is a debate and somebody should give him some information so he knows what to vote on. Councilmember Donaldson said insubordination and dereliction of duties. Councilmember Olson said insubordination is not called out for cause in his contract word for word. He said you need to read his contract as it is not in there. Contracts are written for a reason and signed. It is not a suggestion; it is our guide. It is what we do by it. The contract does not say anything about insubordination and I warned you that it did not. Like he said, if you want to bring the City's reputation down because you do not want to honor a contract that we signed, that is on you. He said my integrity and the City's integrity you are all playing with it, not just Gary's. You are messing with the City's integrity and other council members integrity by not honoring a contract that we agreed to. Councilmember Olson said he sent it to you in

the text message when you asked what are you talking about. He said here is a picture of his contract. Councilmember Fox asked me. Councilmember Olson said yes. Councilmember Fox asked I have his contract. Councilmember Olson said yes it is highlighted exactly what is for cause and insubordination is not one of them. Mayor Countryman said willful misrepresentation to the City is what Alan stated as well as material breach is what he told her today right before we got here. Councilmember Olson said that is the other thing his contract says that we have to inform him. Mayor Countryman said Alan did not say that and he did not tell her that. Councilmember Olson said it is in the contract. Mayor Countryman said she is just saying what Alan told her. Councilmember Olson said if we are going to vote let us vote but just understand the reputation if you want to throw it down the drain for that, it is on you.

Motion carried 3:1.

For Motion: Council Member Langley, Council Member Fox, and
Council Member Donaldson
Against Motion: Mayor Pro-Tem Olsen

2. Consideration and possible action of terminating the current assistant city administrator/director of planning and development.

Dave McCorquodale addressed the Council and stated he wanted Gary Palmer to be able to talk on his behalf.

Gary Palmer addressed the Council to talk on behalf of Dave McCorquodale. Gary Palmer, Dave McCorquodale's immediate supervisor since January of 2023 to now. During that time, Mr. McCorquodale has performed at a high standard, is reliable, knowledgeable about his job, is an outstanding team player and an asset to the City. I have had no disciplinary or performance issues with Mr. McCorquodale. Also during my tenure, I have observed Mr. McCorquodale being publicly vilified over and over again by the same person for no reason. You all know who that person is yet you fail to address the issues. I do not understand why the personal attacks against him are continue and why or how he is on tonight's agenda for termination.

Motion: Council Member Fox made a motion to terminate the current Assistant City Administrator and Director of Planning and Development immediately. Council Member Donaldson seconded the motion. Motion carried 3:1.

For Motion: Council Member Langley, Council Member Fox, and
Council Member Donaldson
Against Motion: Council Member Olsen

3. Consideration and possible action on appointing an interim city administrator.

Councilmember Olson asked if they have a candidate in mind. Councilmember Donaldson said yes. Councilmember Olson asked when did that come about. Mayor Countryman said people are independent thinkers. If they knew that this was on the agenda of course they are going to come. Councilmember Olson said the agenda was on three days ago. Mayor Countryman said right you have 72 hours that is what it is. Councilmember Olson said in three days we popped out an interim city manager in three days. He said we cannot seem to do anything else around here in less than a month. Mayor Countryman said that is what was asked to be put on the agenda. Councilmember Olson said all he has to say is there is a whole lot of very choreographed information. Interim on the agenda. He said never even heard and did not even know we were going to talk about interim. His whole thought process is they let Gary finish out so if now they are going to terminate him, they cannot do that so they have to have an interim. He said this has all been planned and he has not been involved. Mayor Countryman said no it has not. Councilmember Fox said you have all these things but you know what. You are the person that she has seen up here all the time. Councilmember Olson said the evidence is right here and asked how did it happen so quickly. Councilmember Fox said she comes to City Hall when they do have Council but you seem to know that we are having some kind of conspiracy. Councilmember Olson asked how is it that you are all informed of hey we have interim we are going to vote on. Mayor Countryman asked wouldn't you want someone in there. She said she does not even know if they will vote on one tonight but you should want someone at the helm. Councilmember Olson said absolutely. Mayor Countryman said it is only natural to have this on here. Maybe there is nobody that has voted in. Councilmember Olson said before they try to vote somebody in they should at least go out and reach out for one, do some interviews or something. Mayor Countryman said absolutely. Councilmember Olson said this is action, this is not let us talk about getting one. Mayor Countryman said you can choose to table it, you can choose to pick someone. Councilmember Olson said he is just saying it looks very strange from his point of view. Mayor Countryman said it looks natural really. Councilmember Donaldson said I told you the process stinks.

Motion: Council Member Donaldson made a motion to appoint Chief Solomon. Council Member Fox seconded the motion. Motion carried with present voting in favor.

4. **Consideration and possible action on an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Montgomery, Texas, canvassing the returns and declaring the results of the City of Montgomery, Texas, Special Election held on the 5th day of November, 2024, 1) for the creation of the Montgomery Crime control and Prevention District; and 2) extending the term of office for Mayor and Council from two years to four years.**

Mayor Countryman said she has the numbers by Suzie Harvey and read the following: I Suzie Harvey, County Elections Administrator do hereby certify that the attached pages are the final results to the City of Montgomery Special Election held in Montgomery County on November 5, 2024. For Proposition A which is the Crime Control and Prevention District the numbers are 967 for, 391 against. That is a 72.45 percent turnout. Total ballots cast were 1,491. For Proposition B – failed. Totals for it were 585, against 758. Total ballots cast was 1,491 and it did not pass by 72.45 percent.

Motion: Mayor Pro-Tem Olsen made a motion to accept the ordinance as presented and adopt the CCPD. Council Member Donaldson seconded the motion. Motion carried with present voting in favor.

Councilmember Langley – Yes
Councilmember Olson – Yes
Councilmember Fox - Yes
Councilmember Donaldson - Yes

COUNCIL INQUIRY

No Council inquiry was presented at this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Mayor Pro-Tem Olsen made a motion to adjourn the Special City Council Meeting of the City of Montgomery at 5:54 p.m. Council Member Fox seconded the motion. Motion carried with present voting in favor.

APPROVED:

Sara Countryman, Mayor

ATTEST:

Ruby Beaven, City Secretary