

WATCHTOWER

I N V E S T I G A T I V E R E P O R T

City of Italy - Water Pump Repair 2025

Italy paid \$44,800 to rebuild a water pump it was quoted \$15,730 to rebuild. The records are attached.

J U L Y 3 1 , 2 0 2 6

watchtowerci.com

Contents

Italy Paid \$44,800 to Fix a Pump It Was Quoted \$15,730 to Fix	3
Why I Am Publishing This One Year Later	3
The 2025 Water Pump Decision	4
What Was Being Bought	4
How It Moved Through the Council	4
The Two Quotes, Side by Side	5
What Each One Looked Like	5
The Cheaper Quote's Math	5
What the Expensive Quote Actually Was	5
What the Council Was Told on the Record	7
Both Numbers Were Said Out Loud	7
Councilmembers Saw the Gap	7
Only Two Quotes Ever Came In	7
A \$38,000 Cash Price Was Offered and Not Taken	7
The Warranty Question	8
The Recommendation, and the Contractor Behind It	9
A One-Page Memo With No Numbers On It	9
The Winning Vendor Was Already the City's Biggest Contractor	9
Where the Legal Line Actually Sits	10
Did Anyone at City Hall Notice the Line Had Moved?	11
Why This Matters Now	12
What You Can Do	13
In Summary	14
Fair Reading and the Limits of This Report	15
Corrections and Challenges	16
Exhibits	17

Italy Paid \$44,800 to Fix a Pump It Was Quoted \$15,730 to Fix

In July 2025 the Italy City Council voted to spend \$44,800 rebuilding one water pump. A second company had quoted \$15,730 for the same pump, on letterhead, with every task priced out. The council had voted five weeks earlier to go get competing bids and a priced breakdown. It got one competing bid, never got the breakdown, and awarded the contract anyway.

Every document behind that paragraph is attached to the end of this report in its original form.

Why I Am Publishing This One Year Later

Yesterday, July 30, 2026, Basil Zangare, who publishes as BZ Watchdog, released records he obtained from the City of Italy about the Police Department roof project.

His reporting describes this sequence. At the July 13, 2026 council meeting, City Administrator Keith Whitfield told the council that Roof Time was the lowest bidder on the roof, and put the two competing proposals at roughly \$100,000 each. When councilmembers told him to go find those proposals, he came back with one, for about \$47,000, and said he could not locate the other. The records the city later released show three proposals: Roof Time at \$43,975.00 plus tax, Prime Source Construction at \$47,450.00 plus applicable taxes, permits and fees, and TXD Commercial at \$30,606.36. The agenda item authorizing the work had already been written as informal quotes "not to exceed \$43,975.00," which is Roof Time's exact price, printed before the public discussion happened. Zangare has called for the Ellis County District Attorney and the Texas Rangers to look at it.

Read his work and the released documents on his page. I am not republishing his records here, and the roof findings are his, not mine.

I am publishing this because I sat in the room eleven months earlier and watched the same city, under the same city administrator, handle a different purchase the same way. That record has been public the whole time. Nobody has looked at it.

The 2025 Water Pump Decision

What Was Being Bought

The equipment is the circulation pump for the city's water cooling tower at the water plant. It is a Flowserve 12EHL two-stage vertical turbine pump rated 500 GPM at 45 feet, driven by a Nidec vertical hollow-shaft motor, 10 HP at 1180 RPM. Both quotes in the council packet describe that same machine, and both were for rebuilding the existing unit rather than replacing it.

One piece of context belongs up front. On the night of the vote, the cooling tower this pump serves was not yet running. A resident asked the mayor that evening whether work on the cooling tower had started, and was told it had not.

How It Moved Through the Council

Date	Meeting Item	What Happened	Vote
June 9, 2025	Item N, rebuilding the pump at the cooling tower	Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, seconded by Cm. Billy Long, to get some other bids and an itemization from the current bidder	Passed 3 to 2. For: Mosley, Long, Panther. Against: McConnell, Hodge
June 12, 2025	Competing quote received	Jurgensen Pump, LLC issues Estimate #8288, \$15,730.00, marked valid 30 days	Three days after the directive
July 14, 2025	Item I, same subject	Motion by Cm. William Panther, seconded by Cm. Robert Hodge, to approve ATS Construction a contract to rebuild the pump making monthly payments for two years	Passed 4 to 0. For: Mosley, Hodge, Long, Panther
Aug 1, 2025	Bill register	ATS Construction, "PAYMENT (1) TO REBUILD MOTOR"	\$1,866.66
Sep 4, 2025	Bill register	ATS Construction, "PAYMENT (2) TO REBUILD MOTOR"	\$1,866.66
Oct 16, 2025	Bill register	ATS Construction, "PAYMENT (3) TO REBUILD MOTOR"	\$1,866.66

The June 9 vote is the part worth pausing on. The council did not simply take the first quote that arrived. It voted, over two objections, to go get competing bids and to make the existing bidder show its pricing line by line. Thirty-five days later it gave the contract to that same bidder at that same price.

The payments confirm the contract amount without anyone having to take my word for it. Twenty-four payments of \$1,866.66 come to \$44,799.84.

The Two Quotes, Side by Side

What Each One Looked Like

	ATS Construction (Exhibits B, C)	Jurgensen Pump, LLC (Exhibit A)
Total price	\$44,800.00	\$15,730.00
Company letterhead	No	Yes, with logo, PO Box, and phone
Estimate number	None	Estimate #8288
Date on the document	None	06/12/2025
Tax shown	Not stated	\$0.00, stated
Per-task prices	None anywhere on either page	Five priced lines
Line items add up to the total	Cannot be checked	Yes, exactly
Warranty	One year, handwritten	One year, handwritten
Payment terms	24 months at 0 percent, handwritten	None offered
Validity period stated	None	30 days

The Cheaper Quote's Math

Jurgensen priced five tasks. They reconcile to the stated total with nothing left over.

Priced Line	Amount
Field service with crane truck to pull pump and motor	\$980.00
Labor, vertical turbine pump teardown and inspection	\$1,250.00
Pump repair, nine listed sub-tasks	\$11,170.00
Motor repair, four listed sub-tasks	\$1,080.00
Field service with crane truck to install pump and motor	\$1,250.00
Stated total, tax \$0.00	\$15,730.00
Sum of the five priced lines	\$15,730.00

What the Expensive Quote Actually Was

The city's position at the meeting was that ATS had itemized its work. That is half right, and the half that is wrong is the half that matters.

ATS did submit a written scope. Exhibit C lists the tasks: new 416SS line shaft material, machining of wear rings and bowl bushings, repair of the stuffing box, sandblast and epoxy coat inside and out with Sherplate coating, and a motor refresh covering teardown, cleaning, dip and bake in varnish, new bearings, and a function test.

Look at Exhibit C and you will not find a dollar figure anywhere on it. No price for the shaft. No price for the bowl work. No price for the coating. No price for the motor. No labor rate, no crane charge, no subtotal assembled from parts.

The price appears on a separate page, Exhibit B, written by hand under the typed scope:

"1 YEAR WARRANTY"

"TOTAL PRICE 44,800.00"

"WE COULD LET THEM PAY THIS OUT AT 0% PERCENT INTEREST IF THIS COULD HELP."

"24 PAYMENT AT 1,870.00 = 44,800.00"

That is the entire pricing record for a \$44,800 purchase of public money. A scope of work and a priced itemization are different documents, and the council had voted on June 9 to get the second kind.

What the Council Was Told on the Record

The following come from the video of the July 14, 2025 meeting, with timestamps so anyone can check them.

Both Numbers Were Said Out Loud

Asked directly what the two prices were, City Administrator Keith Whitfield told the room at 1:09:56:

"One is one from his company, ATS Construction. They will rebuild it and he will give us a two year payout plan. The total is \$44,800. ... Then you have another company that will be rebuilding for \$15,730."

I want that stated plainly and early, because it is the strongest fact in the city's favor. On this purchase, nobody was misled about the spread. Every councilmember heard both numbers before voting.

Councilmembers Saw the Gap

At 1:00:23, a councilmember:

"That's a huge difference in this one. That's why it's just tough to say, oh, let's just do it. When you're talking 15 versus 40, if it was 100 and 130, it's a little different. 15 to 45, that's a huge difference."

At roughly 1:05:00, the same member, on his own trade background:

"The pump rebuild is what I was doing every day. Not this big, right? But rebuilding pumps is not crazy work in my opinion. So when I see a \$30,000 difference, it jumps out, you know?"

About twelve minutes later, the council approved the higher quote with no vote against.

Only Two Quotes Ever Came In

A resident asked from the floor where the other bids were, since the council had ordered staff to go get them. The answer, at roughly 1:12:15:

"Oh, you only had two?"

"Yes, ma'am."

June 9 called for "some other bids," plural, plus an itemization from the current bidder. What arrived was one competing bid and a scope page with no prices on it.

A \$38,000 Cash Price Was Offered and Not Taken

A councilmember asked the ATS representative what the city would save by paying in full. At 1:08:24:

"That'll make it \$38,000."

The city administrator's response at 1:08:48:

"But if you're going to do that, you may as well just finance it out if you're going to do that. Really? If you're going to do that, you might as well just pay it out. 24 months. Two years."

The council approved the financed structure at \$44,800. On the vendor's own numbers, stretching payments over two years cost the city \$6,800 more than paying that same vendor cash, a premium of nearly eighteen percent. Nobody put the \$38,000 figure back out for a competing offer, and the minutes record no discussion of whether the city could have covered it outright.

The Warranty Question

I asked the council at 1:16:24 why a two-year payment plan was not matched with a two-year warranty, given how confident the vendor was in the work. About thirty seconds later the motion to approve ATS was made. The motion carries no warranty extension. Both quotes offered the same one year. The city financed the more expensive rebuild across twenty-four months while the coverage on it ran out at twelve.

The Recommendation, and the Contractor Behind It

A One-Page Memo With No Numbers On It

Exhibit D is the staff recommendation that went to the council. It is addressed to Mr. Keith Whitfield, subject line "Recommendation for Cooling Tower Circulation Pump Rebuild," and signed James Wallingsford. Its operative sentence:

"After reviewing all the quotes received for rebuilding the cooling tower circulation pump, I recommend selecting the company currently installing the cooling tower."

The stated basis is expertise: experience with cooling towers, and familiarity with how the SCADA system starts and stops the pump based on water temperature. The memo allows that the other companies are "reputable and knowledgeable in pump systems," then concludes they may lack that integration expertise.

The memo carries no dollar figures. It names neither bidder. It never states the price difference it is recommending the city absorb, never weighs that difference against the expertise it cites, and never identifies a single technical problem with the competing quote. It carries no date and no letterhead.

The adopted June 9, 2025 minutes show James Wallingsford delivering the Public Works report, and four councilmembers plus the mayor thanking him for his service to the city. By the July 14 agenda, the Public Works report had passed to Jose Estrada, and a resident raised the public works director vacancy from the floor. The recommendation in front of the council that night came from the public works director who had left.

The Winning Vendor Was Already the City's Biggest Contractor

At the July 14 meeting the ATS representative introduced himself as Larry Parker and identified his company as the contractor already installing the city's cooling tower. He told the council ATS's contract with the city ran a little over \$500,000, and that the project engineer had issued a change order covering the pump rebuild.

The city's own bill registers bear that out.

Date Billed	Vendor	Description in the City's Register	Amount
Sep 18, 2025	ATS Construction	Cooling tower install	\$403,476.00
Oct 29, 2025	ATS Construction	Cooling tower	\$73,675.00
Aug through Oct 2025	ATS Construction	Payments (1) through (3) to rebuild motor	\$1,866.66 each

So the vendor recommended by the departing public works director, and awarded the pump at nearly three times the competing quote, was the vendor already holding the city's largest active contract. That existing relationship was the reason given for the recommendation.

Parker also made an argument to the council that deserves to be repeated fairly. He said that if an outside company rebuilt the pump and it later shed metal into the heat exchanger, ATS would not warranty the damage, because ATS did not do the work. He said his firm carries performance, payment, and maintenance bonds, with the maintenance bond standing behind the warranty. Single-source responsibility on connected equipment has real value, and a bonded contractor is a different risk than an unbonded one. Whether that value came to \$29,070 was the council's call. My concern is not that the council weighed it. My concern is that it weighed it without a priced breakdown from the company it chose, five weeks after voting to require one.

Where the Legal Line Actually Sits

I do not want anyone reading this to walk away with the wrong idea about the law, so here is the boundary in plain terms.

Chapter 252 of the Texas Local Government Code requires a city to advertise and take formal sealed bids before entering a contract above a set dollar amount. Below that line, a city can gather informal quotes instead and decide for itself how much process to apply.

That line moved between these two purchases, and it matters. When the council voted on the pump in July 2025, Section 252.021 set it at \$50,000. Senate Bill 1173, passed by the 89th Legislature and effective September 1, 2025, raised it to \$100,000. That was the first increase since 2007, when it went from \$25,000 to \$50,000.

So the two purchases sat very differently against the law of their own day.

	Water Pump, July 14, 2025	Police Roof, July 13, 2026
Sealed-bid threshold in force that day	\$50,000	\$100,000
Amount authorized	\$44,800	Not to exceed \$43,975.00
Room left under the line	\$5,200	\$56,025
Route used	Informal quotes	Informal quotes, per the agenda's own wording
Quotes obtained	Two	Three
Lowest quote	Not selected, \$15,730	Not selected, \$30,606.36
Written price comparison or tabulation in the record	None located	None produced
Written rationale for the selection	One page, no dollar figures	None produced
Winning vendor's exact price written into the agenda beforehand	No	Yes, \$43,975.00

I want to correct something I might otherwise have implied. These are not two purchases that both squeaked under the same line. The pump did, with \$5,200 to spare under the \$50,000 ceiling that applied that night. The roof did not come close to its ceiling, because by July 2026 that ceiling was \$100,000. Neither purchase triggered the sealed-bid requirement, and I am not claiming either was illegal.

What actually connects them is simpler and, to my mind, worse. In both cases the city gathered informal quotes, chose a company that was not the low quote, and left behind no document comparing the offers on price. The legal room to do that just doubled.

There is a second requirement that did apply to both. Section 252.0215 provides that a municipality "in making an expenditure of more than \$3,000 but less than \$50,000, shall contact at least two historically underutilized businesses on a rotating basis," using the comptroller's list, unless no such business is listed in the county. The pump at \$44,800 and the roof at \$43,975 both fall inside that range. Whether Italy did that on either purchase is not something I can answer from the records I hold, and it is worth asking.

Did Anyone at City Hall Notice the Line Had Moved?

I cannot answer that from these records, and I will not pretend otherwise. Nothing I have seen out of Italy references the change at all.

Here is what does sit on the table. The roof item was noticed to the public as informal quotes "not to exceed \$43,975.00." That figure is Roof Time's exact price. It also lands just under the \$50,000 ceiling that had stopped applying ten months earlier.

In July 2026 that number bought the city nothing. Italy had room up to \$100,000 before any bidding requirement attached. Coming in under \$50,000 was no longer necessary for any purpose.

Which leaves two readings, and I cannot separate them. Either the figure is coincidence, or whoever set it was still working from the old rulebook. I am not suggesting the number was picked to dodge a bidding requirement, because under the law actually in force it would not have needed to be. The council can settle this by asking one question at one meeting.

If City Hall genuinely had not caught the change, it has now. The ceiling on what Italy can spend without advertising, comparing, or tabulating anything doubled while nobody was watching, and the two purchases in this report are the entire public record of how that discretion gets used. Twice the room to spend with no paper trail is an argument for more scrutiny of the spending, not less.

Why This Matters Now

Nothing about the pump is new. The vote happened in the open, the packet was posted, the video exists, and the payments ran through the bills list every month for two years. It sat there.

What changed yesterday is that Zangare's records made it possible to see the same shape twice. One purchase handled this way is a bad night. Two, eleven months apart, in the same department, under the same administrator, is a question about how the city buys things.

There is one more piece I have not seen anyone raise. I was in the room on July 13, 2026, and the city attorney reminded the council on the record that what they were looking at were quotes, not bids. That is a correct statement of the law. It is also the whole argument. Once a purchase is called a quote instead of a bid, the requirements to advertise, to compare formally, to tabulate, and to document why the winner won all fall away. The city gets to decide how much process to apply to itself.

So the honest question is not whether Italy broke Chapter 252. It is what the city does with the discretion Chapter 252 leaves it. On these two purchases, the answer looks like: collect a couple of quotes, pick one, write nothing down. I have requested the audio of the July 13 meeting through a public information request so the attorney's exact wording is on the record rather than resting on my recollection.

The timing makes this more urgent, not less. When the pump was bought, a purchase had to stay under \$50,000 to avoid formal bidding. Since September 1, 2025, that ceiling is \$100,000. Every purchase Italy makes between those two numbers now falls into the same undocumented zone the pump did. If the city had a written policy for how it handles informal quotes, the change would not matter much. It does not appear to have one.

What You Can Do

None of this requires a lawyer or a lawsuit. It requires people asking specific questions in public, on the record.

- **Ask the council to adopt a written purchasing policy for informal quotes.** I can find no city document saying how many quotes are required, how they get compared, who writes down why the winner won, or what gets kept. A one-page policy would fix most of this. Ask for it at Citizen Comments, and ask for it to be placed on an agenda.
- **Ask what the city attorney's guidance actually was.** At the July 13, 2026 meeting the council was reminded these were quotes, not bids. Ask what the city understands that to permit, and whether staff has ever been advised in writing about documenting informal-quote selections.
- **Ask whether the city knows the threshold changed.** Senate Bill 1173 doubled the ceiling on September 1, 2025. Ask when Italy was advised of it, whether any purchasing practice was reviewed in response, and what now happens to a purchase between \$50,000 and \$100,000 that would have gone out for formal bids a year ago.
- **Ask for the comparison documents on both purchases.** For the pump, ask for any written comparison, tabulation, or evaluation of the two quotes, and for the change order Larry Parker said the engineer issued. If the answer comes back empty, that is the finding.
- **Ask whether the two required HUB contacts were made.** Section 252.0215 applies to both purchases. Ask which historically underutilized businesses were contacted, and on what date.
- **Watch for three things at every meeting.** An agenda item that already carries a specific dollar cap, and whether that number turns out to be one vendor's exact price. Any purchase between roughly \$3,000 and \$100,000, which is now the entire informal-quote zone. A staff recommendation that names no price and no competitor.
- **Show up.** The council meets the second Monday of the month at Italy City Hall, 161 W. Main Street. Citizen Comments come near the top. Three minutes is enough to ask one clear question and get it into the minutes.

In Summary

Every finding above, with the record that proves it.

#	Fact	Where to Verify It
1	On June 9, 2025 the council voted 3-2 to get other bids and a priced itemization from the current bidder. McConnell and Hodge voted against.	Exhibit F
2	On June 12, 2025, three days later, Jurgensen Pump quoted \$15,730.00 on letterhead with five priced lines that sum exactly to the total.	Exhibit A
3	ATS Construction's scope page carries no price against any task. Its total appears only in handwriting on a separate page: \$44,800.00.	Exhibits B and C
4	The staff memo recommending ATS names no price, names neither bidder, is undated, and was signed by the public works director who had left the city.	Exhibit D
5	On July 14, 2025 the council awarded ATS the rebuild 4-0, financed over 24 months. The itemization ordered on June 9 never arrived.	Exhibit E
6	ATS offered \$38,000 cash on the record. The city took the \$44,800 financed deal instead, roughly eighteen percent more.	Meeting video, 1:08:24 and 1:08:48
7	Payments of \$1,866.66 ran monthly from August 2025, confirming the \$44,800 total.	City bill registers
8	ATS was already the city's largest active contractor, billing \$403,476 and \$73,675 on the cooling tower that fall.	City bill registers
9	Difference between the two quotes: \$29,070.	Arithmetic
10	The pump sat \$5,200 under the \$50,000 sealed-bid line in force that night. Senate Bill 1173 raised that line to \$100,000 on September 1, 2025, widening the zone where a city can buy without formal bidding.	Tex. Loc. Gov't Code §252.021; SB 1173, 89th Leg.
11	The roof cap of \$43,975 sits under the old \$50,000 ceiling that had stopped applying ten months earlier. Whether anyone at City Hall knew the line had moved is unknown.	Tex. Loc. Gov't Code §252.021; the July 13, 2026 agenda
12	Eleven months later the police roof followed the same shape: informal quotes, low quote not selected, no comparison document in the record.	BZ Watchdog's released records

Fair Reading and the Limits of This Report

You should get the weak points from me rather than find them yourself.

Both prices were stated aloud before the vote. Whitfield said \$44,800 and \$15,730 in open session. No councilmember was told the expensive quote was the cheap one. That is a real difference from what Zangare describes on the roof, and it is the single most important thing in the city's favor here.

The cheaper quote had technically lapsed. Jurgensen dated its estimate June 12, 2025 and marked it valid for 30 days. That window closed around July 12, two days before the vote. Whether Jurgensen would have honored the price is unknown, because the record contains no sign that anyone asked. That cuts both ways, and it raises its own question about why a quote the council ordered in June was allowed to expire before the July meeting.

The bonding argument is legitimate. Parker's point about single-source warranty responsibility on connected equipment is a real consideration, not a smokescreen, and reasonable officials can pay a premium for it.

Nobody ever evaluated whether Jurgensen could do the job. No engineer, no staff memo, no outside opinion in the record assesses the cheaper quote on technical grounds. It may have been the wrong choice. My point is not that Italy picked the wrong pump company. My point is that it made a \$29,070 decision without a priced breakdown from the winner, after voting to require one.

The two purchases did not face the same legal ceiling. The pump was bought under a \$50,000 sealed-bid threshold and landed just beneath it. By the time of the roof the threshold was \$100,000, so the roof was nowhere near its limit. Anyone drawing a straight line between the two on that basis, including me before I checked the date the law changed, has the timeline wrong.

I do not have everything. The change order Parker referenced, the underlying cooling tower contract, and any correspondence about the pump are all still outstanding. So is the audio of the July 13, 2026 meeting. I also cannot tell from these records whether the city met the Section 252.0215 requirement to contact two historically underutilized businesses on either purchase.

Quotations from the July 14, 2025 meeting come from the open-session video and carry timestamps. Where the audio is unclear I paraphrased instead of quoting. Vote counts, movers, and seconders come from the city's adopted minutes, which are attached. The city attorney's quotes-not-bids remark is my own firsthand recollection of the July 13, 2026 meeting and is presented as such pending the audio.

The bill register figures come from the city's own monthly finance packets for September, October, and November 2025. Those packets, the June 2025 agenda, and the full meeting video are not attached here, but I will send any of them to anyone who asks.

Corrections and Challenges

I strive for accuracy, but I acknowledge that I can make mistakes. I welcome private and public dialogue about everything I publish, and I actively seek corrections and challenges to strengthen the integrity of this work. If you believe something here is inaccurate, unsupported, or missing evidence, or if you have information to share, contact me directly at the address below.

feedback@watchtowerci.com

This document is released for immediate publication. You may reproduce, quote, and share it in full or in part, provided it is attributed to Ron Helms, Watchtower Consultation & Investigations, LLC.

Exhibits

The pages that follow reproduce the source records exactly as released, with no editing or annotation. Each carries the SHA256 hash of the file it came from, so anyone holding that file can confirm the attachment matches the original.

Exhibit A: Jurgensen Pump, LLC Estimate #8288, dated 06/12/2025, total \$15,730.00

Source: 2025-07-14 City Council Reg Session.pdf (p. 11) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 6674DDB91091F1AEC4066D8B1B9808F00F8A848D5AE94E1F1055C8AC0441B714

Exhibit B: ATS Construction quote page with handwritten total of \$44,800.00 and 24-payment terms

Source: 2025-07-14 City Council Reg Session.pdf (p. 9) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 6674DDB91091F1AEC4066D8B1B9808F00F8A848D5AE94E1F1055C8AC0441B714

Exhibit C: ATS Construction typed scope of work, showing no price against any task

Source: 2025-07-14 City Council Reg Session.pdf (p. 10) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 6674DDB91091F1AEC4066D8B1B9808F00F8A848D5AE94E1F1055C8AC0441B714

Exhibit D: Undated recommendation memo to Keith Whitfield signed James Wallingsford

Source: 2025-07-14 City Council Reg Session.pdf (p. 12) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 6674DDB91091F1AEC4066D8B1B9808F00F8A848D5AE94E1F1055C8AC0441B714

Exhibit E: Adopted minutes, July 14, 2025 regular meeting, Item I awarding the rebuild to ATS Construction 4-0

Source: 2025-08-11 City Council Consent Items.pdf (pp. 5-6) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 8EFE1EFA142DCAB86378BAF06E9223FB4F6785E4F6DA138A2E1A61F1E161CC90

Exhibit F: Adopted minutes, June 9, 2025 regular meeting, Item N directing staff to obtain other bids and an itemization, passed 3-2

Source: 2025-08-11 City Council Consent Items.pdf (pp. 1-3) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 8EFE1EFA142DCAB86378BAF06E9223FB4F6785E4F6DA138A2E1A61F1E161CC90

Exhibit G: Posted agenda, July 14, 2025 regular meeting, Item I as noticed to the public

Source: 2025-07-14 City Council Agenda.pdf (p. 2) Obtained by: Ron Helms, City of Italy council packet release
SHA256: 54DE3E4D57C76375F4DAC0526750CFE95C1914C7D63D74D5D976B9886BB0EEC9

Jurgensen Pump, LLC
 PO Box 256
 McGregor, TX 76657-0256 USA
 +12548408638

Estimate



ADDRESS

City of Italy
 P.O. Box 840
 Italy, TX 76651

ESTIMATE #	DATE
8288	06/12/2025

1 yr warranty on Repair of anything worked on.

DESCRIPTION	QTY	RATE	AMOUNT
Circulation Pump - Water Cooling Tower Flowserve 12EHL-2 Stage 500 GPM @ 45 FT 10HP 1180RPM TPL = 10 FT			
Field Service with Crane Truck to Pull Pump & Motor	1	980.00	980.00
Labor- VTP T/D & Inspection	1	1,250.00	1,250.00
Pump Repair to Include	1	11,170.00	11,170.00
- Replace bowl shaft 416SS			
- Replace bowl bearings - bronze			
- Replace case wear rings - bronze			
- Replace line shafting 416SS			
- Replace column bearing - rubber insert			
- Replace stuffing box bearing - bronze			
- Replace packing			
- Blast & Epoxy Coat bowls, column, head			
- Assemble Pump			
Motor Repair to Include	1	1,080.00	1,080.00
- teardown			
- standard re-condition, replace bearings			
- dip and bake windings			
- test run			
Field Service with Crane Truck to Install Pump & Motor	1	1,250.00	1,250.00
- Start-Up Services			

Quote Valid for 30 days!

SUBTOTAL	15,730.00
TAX	0.00
TOTAL	\$15,730.00

ATS CONSTRUCTION
134 BANDERA CIRCLE
MAGNANK TX 75156

REPAIR- SEE NOTES

FLOWERVE 12EHL-2

SCOPE OF TYPICAL REPAIR:

NEW LINE SHAFT 416SS MATERIAL

BOWL WORK: MACHINE WEAR RINGS AND BOWL BUSHINGS

REPAIR STUFFING BOX

SANDBLAST SSPC-SP10 AND EPOXY COAT INSIDE AND OUT SHERPLATE PW

NIDEC VHS 10HP 1180 RPM

REFRESH VERTICAL HOLLOW SHAFT MOTOR: CLEAN, BAKE, NEW BEARINGS AND TEST

NOTE: CURRENT LEAD TIME FOR REPAIR 4-6 WEEKS

1 YEAR WARRANTY

TOTAL PRICE 44,800.00

WE COULD LET THEM PAY THIS OUT AT 0 PERCENT INTEREST
IF THIS COULD HELP.

24 PAYMENT AT 1,870.00 = 44,800.00

Therese

Danny Pehr

- Repair of Existing Circulation Pump for the water cooling tower

- o New 416SS Line Shaft Material

- o Machining of Wear Rings and Bowl Bushings

- o Repair stuffing box for shaft seal

- o Sandblast and Epoxy Coat inside and outside with Sherplate Epoxy Coating

- Refresh of Existing Pump Motor

- o Teardown and Cleaning of motor components

- o Dip and bake in varnish to protect windings

- o New Bearings

- o Function Test

To: Mr. Keith Whitfield

Subject: Recommendation for Cooling Tower Circulation Pump Rebuild

After reviewing all the quotes received for rebuilding the cooling tower circulation pump, I recommend selecting the company currently installing the cooling tower.

My recommendation is based on their extensive experience and specialized knowledge of cooling towers. Their understanding extends beyond the mechanical aspects—they have a firm grasp of how the SCADA system integrates with the cooling tower's operation. They understand when and how the SCADA system initiates and halts pump activity based on water temperature thresholds, which is critical to optimizing performance and preventing potential issues.

While I recognize that the other companies are reputable and knowledgeable in pump systems, they may not possess the same level of expertise when it comes to cooling tower operations and integration.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Best regards,

James Wallingsford



**CITY OF ITALY
MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
JULY 14, 2025, 6:00 P.M.
ITALY, TEXAS**

Clinton Sulak-Tovar, Mayor✓
Raymond Mosley, Mayor Pro Tem✓

Luin McConnell
Robert C. Hodge Jr✓

Billy Long✓
William Panther✓

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Roll Call

Anne Sutherland called roll: Mayor Clinton Sulak-Tovar, Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Hodge, and Long were present. Council Member Panther arrived at 6:06 P.M. A quorum was established at 6:00 P.M.

Pledge of Allegiance and

Pledge to the Texas Flag: "Honor the Texas flag; I pledge allegiance to thee, Texas, one state under God, one and indivisible."

Mayor Clinton Sulak-Tovar led the Pledge of Allegiance and the Pledge to the Texas Flag.

Invocation

Council Member Robert Hodge offered the invocation.

2. CITIZENS COMMENTS:

Speaker shall address the presiding officer and not any individual council member, or staff member. The City Council cannot discuss, deliberate or take action on matters not listed on the agenda. Texas Open Meetings Act, Sec.551.041 of the Texas Government Code, but the City Council may refer speaker to city staff for research, resolution or referral for future agenda.

Any disruptive behavior by the speaker or audience member will subject the individual to removal from the meeting/city property and charge with the crime of Disruption of a lawful meeting under the authority of Tex.Penal Code 42.05.

Ron Helms would like clarity on how Citizens Comments are handled. He believes the signs in the chambers contradicts the rules.

Cynthia Chance spoke regarding July 4th, she would like to be involved in future discussions. She also would like to be notified of meetings. She does not like the way the City handled signage.

Joan Grabowski says this was the quietest 4th of July in a long time.

Francis Allen wishes that she would have known more about the parking requirements that took place on the 4th of July. She also is concerned that she only saw signs in her neighborhood.

Holly Zarate would like to replat her land on Richrads Street and needs contact with the

Public Works Director.

3. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES:

June 9, 2025 Regular Meeting

B. APPROVAL OF PAYMENT OF BILLS

C. APPROVAL OF EARNED COMPENSATORY TIME

Council Member William Panther made a motion to approve B & C of the consent items.

Council Member Robert Hodge seconded the motion. Motion passed with 4 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Hodge, Long and Panther.)

4. DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

D. Police (Scott McCauley)

- Monthly Activity Report

E. Public Works (Jose Estrada)

- Monthly Activity Report

F. Municipal Court, Administration (Amber Cunningham)

- Sales Tax Report
- Municipal Court Report
- Permit Report
- Code Enforcement

G. City Administrator (Keith Whitfield)

- Monthly Activity Report

5. REGULAR SESSION:

H. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) with Bill Bratcher regarding an Energy Agreement & allowance of the City Administrator or Mayor to sign all documents.

Bill Bratcher spoke regarding the City's electric services. Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley made a motion to postpone line item H. Council Member Billy Long seconded the motion. Motion passed with 4 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.

I. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding rebuilding the pump at the cooling tower and payment plan options.

Council Member William Panther made a motion to approve ATS Construction a contract to rebuild the pump at the cooling tower making monthly payments for two years. Council Member Robert Hodge seconded the motion. Motion passed with 4 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.

J. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding an agreement with Harris Body Shop to run a sewer line across the property.

Council Member Robert Hodge made a motion to approve an easement agreement with Harris Body Shop to run a sewer line. Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley seconded the motion. Motion passed with 4 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.



**CITY OF ITALY
MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 9, 2025, 6:00 P.M.
ITALY, TEXAS**

Clinton Sulak-Tovar, Mayor✓
Raymond Mosley, Mayor Pro Tem✓

Luin McConnell✓
Robert C. Hodge Jr.✓

Billy Long✓
William Panther✓

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Roll Call

City Secretary Amber Cunningham called roll: Mayor Clinton Sulak-Tovar, Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther were present. A quorum was established at 6:00 P.M.

Pledge of Allegiance and

Pledge to the Texas Flag: "Honor the Texas flag; I pledge allegiance to thee, Texas, one state under God, one and indivisible."

Mayor Clinton Sulak-Tovar led the Pledge of Allegiance and the Pledge to the Texas Flag.

Invocation

Council Member Robert Hodge offered the invocation.

2. CITIZENS COMMENTS:

Joan Grabowski observed the expenses for the month and questioned two payments for mowing of the Upchurch Baseball Field.

3. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES:

May 12, 2025 Regular Meeting

B. APPROVAL OF PAYMENT OF BILLS

C. APPROVAL OF EARNED COMPENSATORY TIME

Council Member Luin McConnell made a motion to approve all consent items. Council Member Robert Hodge seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.

4. DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

D. Police (Scott McCauley)

- Monthly Activity Report

E. Public Works (Jim Wallingsford)

- Monthly Activity Report

F. Municipal Court, Administration (Amber Cunningham)

- Sales Tax Report

- Municipal Court Report
 - Permit Report
 - Code Enforcement
- G. City Administrator (Keith Whitfield)
- Monthly Activity Report

5. REGULAR SESSION:

- H. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding Resolution No. 2025-0609-01, a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Italy, Texas, authorizing the City Administrator, Keith Whitfield, to act as the City's Executive Officer and Authorized Representative in all matters pertaining to the City's participation in the HOME Program.
Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2025-0609-01. Council Member William Panther seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.
- I. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding the appointment of Elijah Garcia to the Planning and Zoning Commission.
Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley made a motion to appoint Elijah Garcia to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Council Member William Panther seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.
- J. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding a contract with Pitney Bowes.
Council Member William Panther made a motion to approve the contract with Pitney Bowes. Council Member Robert Hodge seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.
- K. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding an Interlocal Agreement by and between the Cities of Italy, Midlothian, and Waxahachie, Water Supply Corporations of Rice and Sardis-Lone Elm, Ellis County, Texas, Special Utility Districts of Buena Vista-Bethel, Johnson County, Mountain Peak, and Rockett, the Tarrant Regional Water District, and the Trinity River Authority of Texas for the Ellis County Regional Water Supply Study and decision on payment plan (1 payment or 15 monthly payments).
Council Member Robert Hodge made a motion to approve the Interlocal Agreement for the Ellis County Regional Water Supply Study and make the payment in 15 monthly installments. Council Member William Panther seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.
- L. Review of Audit Fiscal Year 2023-2024.
No action was taken.
- M. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding an agreement with Anderson, Marx & Bohl, P.C. for audit services for fiscal year 2024-2025.
Council Member William Panther made a motion to approve an agreement for audit services with Anderson, Marx & Bohl, P.C. Council Member Luin McConnell seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.
- N. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding rebuilding the pump at the cooling tower and

payment plan options.

Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley made a motion to get some other bids and an itemization from the current bidder. Council Member Billy Long seconded the motion. Motion passed with 3 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members Long and Panther) and 2 nays (Council Members McConnell and Hodge).

- O. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding spending \$4,500.00 for contract labor officers on July 4th.**

Council Member William Panther made a motion to spend \$4,500.00 for contract labor officers on the 4th of July. Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.

- P. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding an Interlocal Agreement for Law Enforcement assistance in the City of Italy, Texas.**

Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley made a motion to approve an Interlocal Agreement for Law Enforcement assistance. Council Member William Panther seconded the motion. Motion passed with 5 ayes (Mayor Pro Tem Raymond Mosley, Council Members McConnell, Hodge, Long and Panther) and 0 nays.

6. COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS:

Raymond Mosley thanked everyone that came to the meeting. When he was elected he understood that his job was to make sure the tax dollars are spent the right way. He does not feel like it is petty to have concerns. He thanked Jim.

William Panther thanked everyone for being at the meeting and Jim for his contributions to the City. He is excited about the July 4th plans.

Luin McConnell thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. He looks forward to the July 4th safety plans.

Billy Long thanked everyone for coming to the meeting.

Robert Hodge thanked Jim for his service to the City. He also thanked the employees.

7. MAYOR COMMENTS:

Clinton Sulak-Tovar thanked everyone for taking the time to come to the meeting and voicing their opinions. He feels as though we are headed in the right direction. He also thanked Jim for his service to the City.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

F. Municipal Court, Administration (Amber Cunningham)

- Sales Tax Report
- Municipal Court Report
- Permit Report
- Code Enforcement

G. City Administrator (Keith Whitfield)

- Monthly Activity Report

5. **REGULAR SESSION:**

- H. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) with Bill Bratcher regarding an Energy Agreement & allowance of the City Administrator or Mayor to sign all documents.
- I. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding rebuilding the pump at the cooling tower and payment plan options.
- J. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding an agreement with Harris Body Shop to run a sewer line across the property.
- K. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding consulting for the water and wastewater System.
- L. Discuss and consider necessary action(s) regarding Ordinance No. 2025-0714-02, an Ordinance setting Council Meeting protocols.

6. **COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS:**

7. **MAYOR COMMENTS:**

8. **ADJOURNMENT:**