GUADALUPE APPRAISAL DISTRICT

Main Office
3000 N. Austin St.
Seguin, Texas 78155
(830) 303-3313
(830) 372-2874 (Fax)
gadprotest@guadalupead.org

Schertz Substation
1052 FM 78 Ste., 103
Schertz, Texas 78154
(830)303-3313 Opt. 0
(877) 254-0888 (Fax)

Minutes

August 5, 2026
5:30 pm

1. **Call to Order:** The regular meeting was called to order at 5:39pm by Mr. Charles Kelm, Chairman.
2. **Roll Call:** Charles Kelm, Jim Lievens, Pam Kifer, Daryl John, Joshua Bright, Letticia Sever were present. Ernesto Rodriguez joined at 5:40pm. Peggy Herman and Dr. Al Burns were not present. Mr. Snaddon was also present. A quorum was established.
3. **Citizens Comments:** No citizens were present and no public comments were offered.
4. **Taxpayer Liaison Report:** Ms. Tavie, TLO was not present.
5. **Consent Agenda** – These items may be acted upon by one motion. No separate discussion or vote on any of the items will be had unless requested by a Board member.
   a. Approval of Minutes of the June Regular Meeting held on June 10, 2026.
   b. Approval of Finance Statement for May 2026
   c. Approval of Finance Statement for June 2026.

   Mrs. Sever made a motion to approve consent agenda as presented. Ms. Kifer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
6. Regular Agenda **Items**
   a. **Action Item:** Discussion and possible action to consider adoption of the 2027 Guadalupe Appraisal District Budget: Mr. Snaddon noted that the board could make any recommendations, removals, or modifications to the proposed budget before approval. Board members discussed the increase in the Board of Directors budget line item. The discussion focused on the approximately $3,200 increase, which raised the board budget from $1,145 in 2026 to over $4,000 in the proposed 2027 budget. Mr. Snaddon clarified that the increase was intended to cover potential training costs for board members and possible conference attendance. Board members questioned whether the increase was necessary, noting that the existing budget of approximately $1,000 to $1,200 had been sufficient in the past, and that previous training expenses had been covered from contingency funds when needed. The consensus appeared to be that the increase was not necessary, though no formal motion was made at this point to reduce the line item. Board members confirmed that any unused budget funds would be returned to the taxing entities at the end of the fiscal year. Motion to Approve 2027 Budget was made by Joshua Bright; Mr. Ernesto Rodriguez seconded the motion. Following confirmation that there was no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

   b. **Discussion item:** Presentation and discussion regarding the proposal from Combs Consulting Group for Technology and Security Systems Design and Consulting Services for the Guadalupe Appraisal District Mary B. Erskine Building Renovation, including scope of services and proposed fees. No action to be taken. Chief Appraiser Peter Snaddon explained that he and architect Ms. Dockery had met with Combs Consulting Group regarding the audio-visual aspects of the renovation project. The consultant reviewed the building plans and submitted a proposal for design phase services. Mr. Snaddon stated that the proposal appeared representative of typical market rates for such services and that Combs Consulting Group would work under the umbrella of the architect, similar to the MEP (mechanical, electrical, and plumbing) contractors, for purposes of payment and invoicing. Mr. Bright raised questions about the procurement process, asking whether this was a recommendation from the architect or whether the consulting services should have been subject to a Request for Proposals process for professional services. Mr. Snaddon explained that under the Texas Government Code, professional services are not required to go through the

RFP or competitive bidding process, which is why the district did not follow that procedure for the architect or for this consultant. Board members sought clarification on whether Combs Consulting Group would be working under contract directly with the district or as a subconsultant to the architect. There was extended discussion about the reporting structure and whether the board needed to approve this contract if the consultant would be working for the architect. Mr. Snaddon explained that the initial proposal was structured for Combs to work directly for the district, but that it could alternatively be structured as an amendment to Ms. Dockery's contract, with Combs working as her subconsultant. Ms. Dockery stated that she would coordinate the consultants' work either way, ensuring their work was included in the overall project package and that they attended job sites at appropriate times. The difference would be whether she included their invoices with hers or whether the district issued separate checks. Board members questioned why this need had not been identified nine months earlier when the project began. Mr. Snaddon explained that initially they had considered using their existing technology consultant, but that individual was semi-retired and no longer able to take on a project of this scope. Ms. Kifer asked how this consultant's role related to the Construction Manager at Risk. Ms. Dockery explained that the Construction Manager at Risk functions as the general contractor and would supervise all contractors and consultants. If Combs was contracted directly with the district, the CMAR would manage both Combs and Ms. Dockery separately; if Combs were a subconsultant to Ms. Dockery, the CMAR would manage only Ms. Dockery. Board members expressed preference for amending Ms. Dockery's contract to include Combs Consulting Group as a subconsultant, rather than having the district contract directly with Combs. This approach was seen as streamlining project management and reducing the administrative burden on the Chief Appraiser. No action was taken on this item as it was a discussion item only.

c. **Action Item:** Discussion and possible action to approve the proposal from Combs Consulting Group for Technology and Security Systems Design and Consulting Services for the Guadalupe Appraisal District Mary B Erskine Building Renovation and to authorize the Chief Appraiser to execute an agreement for those services. This item requested approval of the proposal from Combs Consulting Group for technology and security system design and consulting services, and authorization for the Chief Appraiser to execute an agreement for those services. Following the discussion in the previous agenda item, the board determined that two motions would be necessary: first, to amend the agenda item itself to restructure the consulting arrangement under Ms. Dockery's contract; and second, to approve the expenditure. The Combs Consulting Group proposal totaled $40,000, broken down as follows: $30,000 for the design phase, $2,000 for bidding and award phase, and $8,000 for construction administration. Ms. Dockery confirmed that the bidding phase would involve reviewing bids submitted for technology and security work, and that the construction administration phase would involve inspecting installations as they occur. Board members confirmed that Ms. Dockery would not receive any additional fees or percentages from this amendment beyond the $40,000 pass-through cost for Combs Consulting Group's services. Motion to Amend Action Item 6C, Mr. Bright moved to amend action item 6C so that Combs Consulting Group for technology and security systems falls under Ms. Dockery's contract. Ms. Kifer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote. Motion to Approve $40,000 Amendment to Ms. Dockery's contract for Combs Consulting Group was made by Mr. Bright. Ms. Kifer seconded the motion. The motion to amend Ms. Dockery's contract by $40,000 in support of Combs Consulting Group for technology and security systems passed unanimously by voice vote.

d. **Discussion Item:** Presentation and Discussion regarding the status of the CMAR selection process for the Mary B Erskine Renovation Project (RFQ No 2026-01/RFP No 2026-02) including qualifications and proposal scoring, shortlisted-firm interviews and the evaluation committees ranking and recommendation. No action to be taken. Mr. Snaddon explained that the process began with a Request for Qualifications, which received six responses. One response had to be rejected because it included pricing information on the last page, which was prohibited at the RFQ stage. The remaining five firms were scored by an evaluation committee consisting of Mr. Snaddon, Joshua Bright, Dr. Burns, Jennifer Tovar, and Ms. Dockery. Based on the RFQ scoring, three firms were shortlisted: Koehler Company, Pugh, and Tejas Premier. These three firms were issued a Request for Proposals with a deadline of July 17, 2026. The firms submitted their proposals, which were scored by the evaluation committee. Interviews were conducted on July 28, 2026, with approximately five representatives from each firm attending. Each firm was asked the same core questions as well as firm-specific questions based on their submissions. Minutes of the interviews were provided to the board. Mr. Bright and Dr. Burns were unable to attend the interviews due to work commitments but were provided with complete minutes so they could review what transpired and offer feedback. Mr. Snaddon explained that the overall scoring resulted in Koehler Company ranking first with 96.4 total points out of 100, Pugh ranking second with 75.53 points, and Tejas Premier ranking third with 48.53 points. The detailed scoring breakdown was provided on page 60 of the agenda packet. Board members initially expressed some confusion about the rankings because page 59 showed the RFQ ranking summary, where Pugh had scored highest at 80.8 compared to Koehler at 77.3. Mr. Snaddon clarified that there were two separate scoring processes: the initial RFQ phase and the subsequent RFP phase. The rankings shown on page 60 reflected the final RFP scoring, which included the detailed

proposals and interviews. The primary differentiating factor between Koehler and Pugh was the construction phase fee. Koehler proposed a four percent construction phase fee, while Pugh proposed eight percent and Tejas Premier proposed 11 percent. Mr. Snaddon noted that typical construction management fees range from three to six percent. The fee scoring criterion was weighed at 40 points and was awarded proportionally, with the lowest fee receiving the full 40 points and other firms receiving points calculated by dividing the lowest fee by their fee and multiplying by 40 points. This methodology resulted in Pugh receiving 21.44 points out of 40 for the fee criterion. In other scoring categories, Koehler and Pugh were very comparable. Koehler received 30 out of 30 points for general conditions and scored slightly higher than the other firms in technical approach. Mr. Lievens asked about the firm's locations. Mr. Snaddon confirmed that Koehler is a local Seguin company, while Pugh and Tejas Premier are in San Antonio. Board members discussed whether Koehler's local presence might contribute to their lower fee, as they would not incur travel time or costs to reach the job site. Ms. Kifer noted that Koehler had recently completed renovation of a school building, which provided relevant experience with older structures. Board members also noted that Koehler had worked on the Guadalupe County Courthouse, which provided historical building renovation experience. Mr. Bright, who served on the evaluation committee, explained his positive experience working with Koehler Company on school district projects. He stated that when the school district used Koehler for the Barnes facility renovation, "they finished on time and had us under budget. We were able to do extra stuff because the Koehler Company has worked efficiently." He noted the same occurred with the Ball school renovation, where Koehler "came in under budget and on time, we were able to do a few other things with that money." And we were able to do a bunch of extra stuff for that Ag Facility because of the budget that they worked with." Mr. Bright acknowledged that he knows people at Koehler Company but emphasized his recommendation was based on their demonstrated performance on previous projects. Ms. Dockery, who also served on the evaluation committee, confirmed that she reviewed all submissions and participated in the scoring process. She stated that Koehler is a quality firm. Board members confirmed that Koehler's proposed nine-month construction timeline aligned with the performance period anticipated for the project and was based on the project parameters provided to all firms. No action was required on this discussion item.

e. **Action Item:** Discussion and possible Action to authorize chief Appraiser to negotiate a Construction Manager at Risk agreement with the highest ranked offeror for the Mary B Erskine Renovation project (RFP No. 2026-02) and, if negotiations are unsuccessful, to proceed with the next-ranked offeror (s) in accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 2269. Motion to Authorize Negotiations with Koehler Company made by Joshua Bright moved to approve item 6E as read. Board Member Ernesto Rodriguez seconded the motion. The motion to authorize the Chief Appraiser to negotiate a construction manager at risk agreement with Kahler Company as read passed unanimously by voice vote. Mr. Snaddon noted that the district had reached out to their attorney for suggestions regarding legal representation during the contract negotiations, as this work is outside the scope of the district's regular attorney. The attorney provided six or seven referrals to firms with public sector Construction Manager at Risk experience, and Cathy would contact those firms to determine their availability and qualifications.

f. **Discussion Item:** Chief Appraiser Report to include Summary of 2026 Certification, BOD At Large Election Update, GAD Staffing Update, Customer Service Survey Results (April -July) and 2026 2nd Quarter Clericals. Mr. Snaddon reported that the district certified the appraisal roll in a timely manner. He noted that at the previous board meeting, the district had projected certification would occur around day nine after the certification period, but the day after that meeting, he met with staff members Patty and Jennifer to develop a strategy to meet the deadline, which was successful. Taxable values increased slightly across the board for most taxing jurisdictions. The district received approximately 25,000 protests, with eFiling increasing by 40 percent compared to the previous year. The total value reduction on resolved protests as of the report date was approximately $701 million from initially certified values, representing an 8.3 percent reduction. Mr. Snaddon reported that property owner representatives filed 65.1 percent of all protests, a slight increase from 64 percent in 2024 and 64.7 percent in 2025. Of the 15,841 protests filed by agents or representatives, 41 percent resulted in reductions totaling approximately $449 million of the total $701 million in reductions. Property owners filing on their own behalf actually had a better reduction rate, though board members noted this could be explained by agents handling primarily higher-value commercial properties. Mr. Kelm requested that future reports break out the reduction data to show the specific impact of represented versus unrepresented property owners. He noted his perception that representation is growing because service providers make it easy for property owners and are becoming more aggressive in their marketing. Mr. Snaddon agreed to provide that analysis. The district conducted a customer service survey during protest season with 128 responses. The overall rating was 4.86 out of 5, with 90 to 95 percent of respondents rating the district as excellent. There were 57 positive comments. Mr. Snaddon reported that notice of the board of directors at-large election was posted on July 17, 2026. The district received a contract from Elections Administrator Teal estimating election costs at approximately $50,000. Ms. Teal indicated this estimate could change once all jurisdictions holding elections are confirmed, as costs would be shared among all entities participating in the November election. The deadline for candidates to file for the election is August 18, 2026. Board positions up for election include those currently held by

Ms. Kifer, Mr. Kelm, and Ms. Herman. Mr. Snaddon stated he had notified all affected board members of the filing deadline. Board members discussed what would occur if fewer candidates file than there are positions available. Mr. Snaddon explained that in such cases, the board would appoint members to fill vacant positions, as occurred two years prior when Board Member Kelm was appointed after Ms. Kifer and Ms. Herman ran unopposed. Mr. Snaddon reported that seven positions were vacant at the time of the previous board meeting. Currently, 36 positions are filled. Two seasonal positions transitioned to full-time employment after those employees demonstrated strong performance during the appeals season. Two Public Service Assistant vacancies remain in Schertz and Seguin. Those positions are currently in the interview process, with anticipated start dates the week of August 24, 2026. The district is recruiting for a mapping position, with interviews scheduled to begin the week of August 24, 2026. Two appraiser positions were posted on the district website and Facebook page. Mr. Snaddon indicated he would like to fill these positions as soon as possible so new hires can receive training during the fall season. Board members inquired whether the positions were posted on the Texas Association of Appraisal Districts job board. Mr. Snaddon confirmed the positions were submitted to that platform the day of the meeting. Board members suggested additional platforms such as Indeed and LinkedIn for recruiting. Mr. Snaddon noted that the tax code requires presentation of second quarter clerical reports to the board. He provided the access path for board members interested in inspecting the quarterly clericals and offered to send the information to any board member upon request. No questions or discussion followed the Chief Appraiser's report.

7. Directors' Report – Board members did not add any items for future agendas or raise additional questions or comments.

8. Adjournment – Meeting was adjourned at 6:23 pm

(If during the course of the meeting, any discussion of any item on the agenda should be in a closed meeting, the Board will conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the Texas Open Meeting Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, subchapters D and E)

Jim Lievens

Charles O. Kelm, Chairman
G.A.D. Board of Directors
Jim Lievens, Vice Chair

Letticia Serer

Daryl John, Secretary
G.A.D. Board of Directors
Letticia Serer, Board member