

State of Texas

County of Brazoria

City of Freeport

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the City Council of Freeport, Texas met on Wednesday, April 29, 2026 at 6:00 PM at the Freeport Council Chamber located at 430 North Brazosport Blvd., Freeport Texas for the purpose of considering the following agenda items:

City Council: Mayor Jerry Cain  
Councilman Jeff Pena  
Councilman Jarvis Davis  
Councilman George Matamoros  
Councilman Winston Rossow

Staff: Danielle M Kelly, DPA, City Manager  
Jennifer Howell, Police Chief/Assistant City Manager  
Chris Duncan, City Attorney  
Clarisa Fernandez, City Secretary  
Toby Cohen, IT Director

|           |                   |                  |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|
| Visitors: | David McGinty     | Carol Parker     |
|           | Barbara Pearl     | Mark Parker      |
|           | Con McCleester    | Nicole Mireles   |
|           | Diane McCleester  | Sam Reyna        |
|           | Manning Rollerson | Ron Bachman      |
|           | Jane Scott        | Margaret Bachman |
|           | Chelsea Soto      | Pamela Dancy     |

**Call to Order:**

Call to Order - Jerry Cain, Mayor

Mayor Cain called the meeting of the Freeport City Council to order at 6:01P.M. on April 29, 2026, declaring a quorum was present.

Invocation - Councilman

Councilman Rossow led the Invocation.

Pledges - Pledge of Allegiance to the United States; Pledge of Allegiance to the State of Texas.

Councilman Rossow led the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States and the Pledge of Allegiance to the State of Texas.

Matters Subsequent to Posting.

City Manager Dr. Danielle Kelly stated that there were no matters subsequent to posting.

Audience Participation – Anyone who has registered to speak prior to the meeting being called to order and desires to address the City Council will be heard at this time, or during the discussion of an item listed on the agenda. These forms are located by the City Secretary. After completing the form, give it to the City Secretary. She will give it to the Mayor. The Mayor will call on you when that item is presented, once a motion has been made by Council then public participation will not be allowed. You will have four (4) minutes to make your comments regardless of the number of agenda items to be addressed.

Mayor Cain acknowledged that there were significant emotions in the room, noting that those emotions were driven by a passion for this city. He asked all in attendance to control that passion throughout the meeting and reminded everyone that only one person would speak at a time, whether a council member or a citizen, and that each speaker would be given full respect while addressing the body.

Sam Reyna resides at 2002 North Avenue G. He addressed the Council directing comments at Councilman Pena, describing him as a predator that injures or exploits others for personal gain or profit and referencing an illustration displayed near a playground at a recent RiverFest event. Mr. Reyna then raised a legal challenge to the recall petition, citing Texas Local Government Code Chapter 21, Section 21.102, Subsection A, which he stated it required a 180-day waiting period between recall petitions. He contended that the required six months had not elapsed between the prior petition and the current one, characterizing the recall as illegal. He urged the Council to vote against the recall and allow the county judge to make the determination, and further stated that it had come to his attention that City Attorney Chris Duncan had allegedly told a councilman he was required to vote yes, which Mr. Reyna declared to be false.

Barbara Pearl resides at 1710 West 10th Street. She directed her remarks towards Councilman Pena, calling him the biggest self-centered person she had ever encountered and expressing that the city did not need him in Freeport. She questioned how sufficient signatures were gathered for the recall, suggesting signers may have included strangers at the beach or the fish and dolphins. She expressed strong support for Mayor Cain, stating, Jerry Cain is a better man than you will ever be and a better mayor.

Diane Parker resides at 95 Dolphin Lane. She described the meetings as a recurring debacle and asked two principal questions: how much city money was being spent on the ongoing recalls, and how council members could be held accountable for their conduct. She cited the life-size cardboard image of the Mayor on a woman's body displayed at Riverfest, expressing concern about the effect on Mayor Cain's three school-age children and their peers. She urged the Council to rein in the behaviors and conduct themselves as adults, adding that if members had personal disputes, they should find a lawyer, go to court, but stay out of here with those behaviors.

Richard Curd resides at 1214 West 8th Street. He raised two inquiries: first, asking what had become of the \$340,000 given to a contractor for City Hall repairs; and second, questioning whether the city's program of trapping, spaying or neutering, and returning feral cats constituted a violation of law. Mayor Cain and City Manager Dr. Danielle Kelly noted his comments in writing and offered to follow up with Mr. Curd directly after the meeting.

Margaret Bachman resides at 96 Dolphin Lane. She formally questioned the validity and accuracy of the statements contained in the recall petition, stating that the language used appeared to distort the facts, raising doubt about its reliability and integrity.

Ron Bachman resides at 96 Dolphin Lane. He delivered a formal written objection to the recall petition, a signed copy of which had been submitted to the City Secretary. Mr. Bachman prefaced his remarks by encouraging those in the audience not to turn the proceeding into a pep rally. He presented four substantive legal objections: (1) the petition must be a single, complete filing and there is no charter provision allowing a petition to be supplemented after initial circulation; (2) the 180-day provision under Texas Local Government Code Section 221.102 governs when a recall effort may begin, not the duration of circulation or ability to amend; (3) combining signatures collected in April with those collected in January or February constitutes multiple distinct efforts improperly merged, rendering the petition legally defective; and (4) credible reports that petition sheets were left at local businesses for individuals to sign outside the presence of the circulator, which, if true, would directly violate the requirement that signatures be witnessed by the

circulator under oath. Mr. Bachman concluded by requesting that the petition be evaluated as a single filing, that sheets with defective affidavits be invalidated, and that a finding of insufficiency be issued if the charter's requirements were not strictly satisfied.

Mark Parker resides at 76 Dolphin Lane, stated simply that he agreed with Mr. Bachman's objections.

Tom Pearson resides at 110 South Front Street. He expressed that Mayor Cain had done a commendable job as mayor for the last two years despite several disruptions from Mr. Pena. He questioned whether City Attorney Duncan, upon reviewing Mr. Bachman's written objections, would render a formal legal determination on the matter. He also noted for the record that council candidate Ms. Nicole had been present at meetings while her opponent had not yet attended a single one.

Kenneth Hayes echoed praise for Mayor Cain, commending him for maintaining his composure. He expressed concern over the impact that Councilman Pena's actions and rumors had on the families, wives, children, and other relatives of the individuals targeted, stating that Councilman Pena has no shame about that.

Chelsea Soto resides at 1706 West 10th Street. She addressed Councilman Pena directly and characterized him as an arrogant bully, noting that a student from Sweeney had recently taken his life due to bullying. She questioned Councilman Pena's obsession with her father and described a prior incident in which she alleged Councilman Pena had filed a false police report, characterizing it as a Class B misdemeanor. She also addressed City Attorney Duncan, stating that it was obvious the only person he was for was Mr. Jeff, and alleged that Mr. Duncan had represented Councilman Pena in Houston, which she said he was not authorized to do.

Troy Rivers resides at 12877 Coronado Drive. He read a prepared statement calling upon the Council to fulfill what he characterized as its legal duty. He stated that once a recall petition has been verified as valid, the Council's obligation is legally binding, not discretionary, and that personal views, political considerations, or delay tactics have no place in this process. He urged the Council to certify the petition, follow the charter, and honor their oath, warning that failure to do so would force citizens into unnecessary legal action to compel what is already required.

Manning Rollerson spoke as a resident of the East End of Freeport, expressing frustration with what he described as years of inaction and deception by those who had previously held positions of authority in the city. He referenced a documentary filming in downtown Freeport and stated that the city's lack of progress could be traced to poor representation. He declared himself in favor of the recall, stating he wanted answers on why the city of Freeport did nothing for the people on the East End of Freeport, Texas. He asserted that following one's oath was a matter of honor and righteousness, calling it hypocritical to pray before a meeting and then fail to lead by example.

Mayor Cain addressed the Council following the close of audience participation by first asking City Attorney Christopher Duncan whether the legal concerns raised by speakers had changed his position on the petition's sufficiency. City Attorney Christopher Duncan provided a legal explanation. He acknowledged that he had originally shared the view that the supplementation of the petition could be problematic under state law and that he had presented those concerns in an email to Mr. Longley, the principal attorney with the Texas Municipal League (TML). Mr. Longley responded by citing a Texas Supreme Court case involving similar circumstances in San Antonio, and rendered the opinion that the two parts of the petition could be combined and resubmitted as a single petition, satisfying the requirements of both the applicable statutes and the Supreme Court's precedent. Mr. Duncan explained the foundational principle: The people have more authority than the government. The government answers to the people, the people do not answer to the government. He stated that registered voters have an absolute right to demand a special election upon

presenting a petition with sufficient signatures, and that once that threshold is met, the city council cannot stop it and the courts cannot stop it. Citing the San Antonio case, he explained that the Texas Supreme Court had found that city councils possess only a ministerial duty in this context and have no authority to judge the legality of the petition, because permitting the government to invalidate a petition calling it to account would leave no meaningful check on that government. He further noted that the Supreme Court stated courts will never prevent a special election called by petition, and that any procedural defects may only be reviewed after an election has occurred. He quoted the Court directly: "The fundamental right of citizens to petition and demand a special election shall not be denied. Every inference is in favor of holding the election." Based on the TML attorney's opinion and the Supreme Court's reasoning, Mr. Duncan concluded that there was no legal authority for the Council to vote against the petition, emphasizing that a vote to call the election was not an expression of support for the recall but rather a ministerial legal obligation. He also clarified that the 180-day provision cited in audience comments applies to when an unsuccessful recall election has occurred, not merely when a petition was presented. Mr. Duncan said this did not change his position towards the petition.

Mayor Cain then read into the record a formal letter summarizing the administrative review of the recall petition, signed by City Secretary Clarisa Fernandez, City Manager Dr. Danielle Kelly, and City Attorney Christopher Duncan. The review had been conducted independently by the City Secretary, City Manager, and administrative staff on a line-by-line basis using current Brazoria County voter registration records, the Texas Election Code requirements for recall petitions, and Article 6 of the Freeport Home Rule Charter. The letter stated that the petition sought the recall of Mayor Jerry Cain pursuant to Charter Section 6.02, which requires signatures from at least 51 percent of votes cast at the last regular general election but no fewer than 200 qualified petitioners. Based on official records from the May 4, 2024, general election, in which 435 voters participated, 51 percent equaled 221.85, rounding up to a threshold of 222 valid signatures. Of the 295 total signatures submitted, 231 were verified as valid confirming that signers were registered voters with complete residential addresses and signatures dated within the 180-day window prior to the April 23, 2026 filing date. Sixty-four signatures were determined invalid due to missing information, the signer not appearing in voter registration records, duplicate entries, or signatures dated outside the 180-day window. The City Secretary accordingly determined that the petition met the required threshold of 222 valid signatures and therefore qualified for further action under the charter.

## **Business**

Consideration and possible action approving Ordinance No. 2026-2763 calling a Recall Election to recall Mayor, Jerry Cain. Election for the City of Freeport, Texas.

Mayor Cain read the item regarding consideration and discussion of a recall petition. He stated that the City Council would consider the recall of Mayor Jerry Cain following the submission of a petition signed by registered voters of the City of Freeport requesting a recall election. He reported that the recall petition had been submitted by registered voters seeking the recall of Mayor Jerry Cain. The petition alleges violations of duties to the City and its citizens, including claims of incompetency, misconduct, and malfeasance in the performance of official duties. Mayor Cain further noted that, pursuant to applicable law, upon receipt and verification of a valid recall petition, the City Council is required to take action to call a recall election. He added that if the petition meets statutory requirements, the Council must adopt an ordinance calling a recall election in accordance with state and local election laws. Regarding financial impact, Mayor Cain stated that the City is currently involved in ongoing litigation that may result in significant financial exposure. He noted that actions related to these matters could affect the City's legal position, insurance coverage, and defense costs. He further advised that potential financial impact could reach into the millions, including litigation expenses, settlements or judgments, and related costs. Mayor Cain concluded by stating that this was the agenda item before the Council for consideration that evening.

A motion was made by Councilman Pena to approve Ordinance No. 2026-2763 calling a Recall Election to recall Mayor, Jerry Cain. Election for the City of Freeport, Texas, seconded by Councilman Davis with discussion that followed.

Councilman Davis spoke in support of the motion. He acknowledged the efforts of citizens who had researched the applicable law and expressed respect for their participation. He stated that he had to defer to the Council's attorney, who had done the research and obtained a second opinion, and the law and the advice says this is what we have to do. He emphasized that the vote was not an admission of guilt against the Mayor, explaining it was just about the citizens of Freeport. The citizens signed the petition. They asked for this. We work for the citizens. He further clarified for the record that he had never used a profanity during a council meeting and that when he had excused himself from the chamber on a prior occasion, it was to avoid escalating a situation rather than out of disrespect.

Councilman Pena asked City Manager Dr. Danielle Kelly to describe, in her own words, the process used to evaluate the signatures in the petition. Dr. Kelly explained that the petition, totaling over 600 scanned pages, was emailed to all reviewers. Reviewers searched an official Brazoria County voter registration spreadsheet of over 5,000 entries using birthdate, last name, and address to locate each signatory. Signatures falling outside the 180-day window, lacking a birthdate, or carrying an incorrect birthdate were marked invalid. Duplicate signatures instances where the same individual had signed during both the January/February and April collection periods were identified by cross-referencing entries. Dr. Kelly stated that she personally spent at least nine hours in a single day reviewing signatures, after which all verifiers met as a group to go through the list line by line, reconciling their counts until they matched on the number of valid signatures. She confirmed that the reviewers did not have signature cards to verify authenticity but confirmed whether each signer appeared on the county's voter registration list. The reviewing team consisted of Dr. Kelly, City Secretary Clarisa Fernandez, Laura Cramer, Lily, and Crystal; City Attorney Christopher Duncan subsequently reviewed all rejections with the group as well. Councilman Pena also asked Dr. Kelly to describe the security measures used to protect the integrity of the petition documents throughout the review process. Dr. Kelly explained that she approached the process with the mindset of "a Las Vegas money count room," coordinating with Chief Howell to ensure body camera coverage was maintained at all times when the petition was submitted, scanned, copied, and returned to Councilman Pena. The original petition was stored in a secure room upstairs with a security code and a ceiling-mounted camera on the door to prevent any tampering.

City Attorney Christopher Duncan thanked the staff for their professionalism and thoroughness under what he acknowledged was a particularly stressful set of circumstances, given the politically charged nature of the process.

Councilman Matamoros stated that he had two questions for legal counsel and requested simple yes-or-no answers. Councilman Matamoros asked whether the City Charter contains a specific recall petition filing deadline. City Attorney Christopher Duncan responded that, to his knowledge, it does not. Councilman Matamoros then asked whether State of Texas laws supersede municipal laws, including city laws or home-rule charter laws. Mr. Duncan responded that state law does supersede local law, but further explained that courts interpret state law and determine legal questions relating to recall petitions. Mr. Duncan referenced Texas Supreme Court rulings, stating that a city council does not have the authority to determine whether a recall petition is legally valid, as that authority rests with the courts. He explained that council members are not permitted to act as judge and jury in matters involving their own recall and that legal disputes concerning petitions must be resolved through the judicial process. He stated that the Texas Supreme Court has held that elections should generally proceed, and that legal challenges may be addressed after the election occurs. Councilman Matamoros then referenced the City of San Antonio's charter provisions regarding recall procedures, stating that San Antonio's charter clearly outlines the applicable requirements, while the City of

Freeport's charter does not. He further stated that upon being elected, he was provided a binder containing the City of Freeport Code of Ordinances. He cited Charter Section 6.05, which requires the petition to be presented to the City Council within five days of filing, noting that this step had been followed. He then cited Section 6.06, which provides that the officer facing recall may, within five days of the petition's presentation to the Council, request a public hearing to present facts pertinent to the charges and that the Council must schedule that hearing between five and fifteen days after receiving such a request. Councilman Matamoros spoke that by proceeding directly to a vote on calling the election without first providing Mayor Cain that opportunity, the Council was putting the cart before the horse. Councilman Matamoros further contended that because the City's charter contains no provision governing petition supplementation or amendment timelines, the matter falls under Texas Election Code Chapter 277. He read from the current statute: "A petition may not be supplemented, modified, or amended on or after the date it is received by the authority with whom it is required to be filed, unless expressly authorized by law." He presented the legal opinion of an outside attorney he had consulted who differed from the TML attorney's view as supporting the position that the combined petition was invalid under state law because it was supplemented in violation of Chapter 277. He added that this outside attorney had also stated that any resident of the City of Freeport could file a lawsuit and challenge the petition in court, potentially all the way to the Supreme Court. Councilman Matamoros also challenged the assertion that council members were legally required to vote in favor of the recall, stating that the same legal counsel who had told them they must vote yes had also told them that nobody can force us to vote a certain way, and that any suggestion of jail time or legal penalties for voting no was, in his outside attorney's words, asinine. He raised additional concerns about the substance of the petition process, stating that he had spoken with individuals who signed the petition and were lied to and told things that were just not true. He noted that had the charter contained a supplementation provision, it would also have typically included a right for signers to withdraw their names during the open period a right he argued was never offered to those who had signed during the initial January/February circulation. He also referenced reports that stacks of petition sheets had been left in businesses for people to sign without a circulator present, as well as his belief that the council member who had originated the petition was not the person who circulated it. Councilman Matamoros read from the Charter, stating that if all requirements of the Charter have been met and the City Council fails or refuses to receive a recall petition, order a recall election, or discharge any duties imposed by the Charter relating to a recall, then the County Judge of Brazoria County is empowered and directed to discharge those duties otherwise assigned to the City Secretary or City Council. Councilman Matamoros stated that the Council had just been told that the decision was up to the Council, referencing a Texas Supreme Court ruling described as quite similar. Councilman Matamoros further characterized the recall matter as an entire charade by a council person and stated that it was an attempt to cover up alleged misdeeds and failures during six years of service on the Council. He concluded his remarks by characterizing the recall effort as a charade intended to cover up misdeeds and distract from the initiating council member's own record of six years on the council.

City Attorney Christopher Duncan stated that he wished the unnamed attorney involved had contacted or spoken with him directly, as he believed that could have eliminated some confusion. He noted that he had sent specific emails regarding the matter to the Council, including to Councilman Matamoros. Mr. Duncan stated that he agreed with some of Councilman Matamoros's points and explained that it had been his opinion that supplementation of the petition would not be allowed under state law. He stated that he communicated those concerns in an email to the Texas Municipal League (TML), identifying issues he believed affected the legality and compliance of the petition under state law regarding supplementation. Mr. Duncan further explained that certain deadlines may arise from city charters or from other election laws, such as tax elections, and that those deadlines could affect supplementation requirements. He stated that the TML attorney did not conclude that supplementation itself was permissible, but instead advised that the two parts of the petition could be combined and resubmitted as a single petition. Mr. Duncan referenced the San Antonio Supreme Court case, explaining that supplementation was not the issue before the Court in that matter. He stated that the issue in the San Antonio case involved council members determining that the language of a recall petition was legally insufficient and voting against it, after which the deadline for the

May election had passed. According to Mr. Duncan, the Supreme Court ruled that the petitioners could either proceed with the election or combine and resubmit the petition for a later election date. Mr. Duncan stated that the TML attorney's recommendation was based on that Supreme Court ruling and concluded that the petition parts could be combined and resubmitted as a single petition. He further reiterated that the Supreme Court held that city councils do not have authority to conduct legal analysis regarding the validity of recall petitions, as such authority belongs to the courts. Mr. Duncan stated that he was unaware of anyone telling council members they would face penalties for voting against the matter, but emphasized that the Supreme Court held that the City Council has a legal obligation to vote in favor of calling an election if the petition contains sufficient signatures. Referring to Section 6.11 of the City Charter cited by Councilman Matamoros, Mr. Duncan stated that the provision addresses situations in which council members fail to discharge their duties. He stated that the Charter recognizes the possibility that elected officials may act based on politics rather than legal obligations and therefore authorizes the County Judge to order the election if the Council fails to do so. Mr. Duncan concluded by stating that while some individuals may distrust or question his opinion, he believed the opinion from the TML attorney, together with the Supreme Court case, demonstrated that the matter was not a political decision.

Councilman Pena offered a brief closing comment, observing that the process had been designed to minimize legal exposure, stating, the whole point that we were trying to do is trying to do all of our due diligence so that we invite no lawsuits. He reiterated that a higher legal opinion had been sought and documented, and that the sole remaining question was whether the petition had been handled legally, to which he answered affirmatively. Councilman Pena addressed City Manager Dr. Danielle Kelly regarding the recall petitions previously submitted. Councilman Pena referenced an earlier question in which he had asked whether Dr. Kelly would attest to the validity of the petitions. He stated that Dr. Kelly had indicated she would at least attest to the process used to ensure validity. Councilman Pena then asked Dr. Kelly whether, in her opinion, the petition and the process used to validate the petition had been conducted with full integrity. Dr. Kelly responded that she would attest to the integrity of her staff and to the manner in which the intake, processing, and verification of the signatures were handled to ensure that the signatures matched the list provided by the registrar.

Mayor Cain stated that he also had legal concerns regarding the recall petition and indicated that many of those concerns echoed comments made earlier during the meeting. He stated that while he understood the process, he believed the resubmission of the petition effectively circumvented state law regarding supplementation, although it was not formally labeled as supplementation. Mayor Cain stated that he believed there were legal issues involved and wanted those concerns placed on the record. Mayor Cain also addressed concerns regarding citizens wishing to remove their names from the petition. He stated that, in his opinion, once a petition is submitted, signatories no longer have the opportunity to withdraw their signatures, and he noted that some individuals from the original petition allegedly wished to remove their names after submission. He suggested that the City may wish to consider future charter amendments to address recall procedures and related issues. Mayor Cain stated that several residents had informed him they had not seen the petition or were unaware of the accusations contained within it. He then proceeded to address the allegations outlined in the petition and provided his responses to each allegation. Regarding allegations involving former City Manager Lance Petty and pending litigation against the City, Mayor Cain stated that his recommendation had been to suspend Mr. Petty and conduct an investigation. He stated that had Council followed that recommendation, the City might not be facing the lawsuit. Mayor Cain further stated that the lawsuit remained in its early stages and that, to his knowledge, no City Council members had been involved in the litigation. Mayor Cain also discussed an unemployment benefits hearing involving City Manager Lance Petty and certain council members. He stated that he had not initially been informed or invited to participate and that he believed the Mayor should be aware of and involved in City matters. He acknowledged receiving a text message from Clay Thomas asking whether he wished to participate in the hearing, to which he replied affirmatively. Mayor Cain stated that beyond that response, there were no meetings, calls, or coordination before or after the hearing. He further stated that he did not provide

testimony and therefore did not assist or contribute to the lawsuit. Addressing allegations concerning Covarrubias Construction and a \$345,000 wire transfer, Mayor Cain stated that he was serving as a council member, not Mayor, at the time of the incident. He explained that former City Manager Lance Petty contacted him regarding the issue after being unable to reach then-Mayor Bass. Mayor Cain stated that he subsequently advised Mayor Bass to speak directly with Mr. Petty regarding the matter. Mayor Cain stated that he chose to gather facts and speak with individuals involved rather than make premature public accusations. He noted that several meetings took place involving himself, Mr. Petty, and the Mayor. He further stated that he and Councilman Matamoros attempted to place the matter on a November 6, 2023 agenda, but the submission missed the deadline and was instead scheduled for the November 20, 2023 meeting. Mayor Cain stated that Councilman Pena later called a special meeting on November 21, 2023, and that the matter was ultimately discussed there. He emphasized that approximately 37 days elapsed between the time he became aware of the issue and the time it was formally presented, disputing claims that there had been a two-month cover-up. Regarding allegations involving threats against Councilman Pena, Mayor Cain denied directing Police Chief Howell to reduce security at City Council meetings. He stated that he had one conversation with Chief Howell regarding meeting security, during which she advised that ensuring safety at council meetings was part of her responsibility as Chief of Police. Mayor Cain stated that he agreed with her assessment and further stated that he merely asked whether officers could be positioned on the opposite side of the wall rather than directly in the chamber. He stated that Chief Howell agreed that arrangement would be sufficient. Mayor Cain further denied conspiring with Lance Petty to provide an opportunity for an assault against Councilman Pena, stating that it is impossible to conspire regarding matters of which one is unaware. He also stated that all members of Council received the same email report at the same time regarding the allegations. Mayor Cain referenced an investigation conducted by the Texas Rangers and stated that the alleged conspiracy was determined not to be a credible plot involving physical assault, kidnapping, or murder. He further stated that, according to the Texas Rangers report, the individual referenced in the recorded conversation with Chief Howell had been deceased for nearly two years prior to the conversation. Mayor Cain also referenced an allegation regarding failure to report insubordination and stated that he did not know what the allegation referred to and expected the matter would be discussed further at a special meeting. In closing, Mayor Cain stated that the petition signatures had been verified and that the validity of the signatures themselves was not in dispute. However, he characterized the petition as a political witch hunt motivated by hate and revenge by a council member. Mayor Cain further stated that he had personally been informed of alleged lies and tactics used to persuade citizens to sign the petition. He stated that he did not fault the citizens of Freeport for signing, asserting that the individual involved had almost mastered the art of manipulation. Mayor Cain concluded by stating that individuals who wished to address what he described as wrongdoing associated with the petition should show up to the polls in November and show their support there.

Mayor Cain called the motion to a vote with all present and voting "Aye" 2-3. The motion failed. Mayor Cain voted "Nay". Councilman Matamoros voted "Nay". Councilman Rossow voted "Nay".

### **Executive Session**

The Council did not convene in Executive Session.

### **Reconvene into Open Session:**


Take any action resulting from Executive Session.


### **Adjournment**

Adjournment – Jerry Cain, Mayor

A motion was made by Councilman Matamoros to adjourn, seconded by Councilman Davis with all present

and voting "Aye" 4-1. Mayor Cain adjourned the meeting at 7:56P.M. Councilman Pena voted "Nay".

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jerry Cain, Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Clarisa Fernandez City Secretary