

Central Appraisal District of Johnson County Board of Directors Special Called Meeting

Tuesday, September 1, 2026 – 6:00 PM
Cross Timbers Branch Meeting Room, Cleburne Conference Center
1501 W. Henderson Street Cleburne, Texas

In Attendance:

JCAD Board of Directors

Chairperson Tina White, Vice Chairperson
Peter Svendsen, Secretary Jason Marbut, Board
Member Larry Trammell, Board Member Chris
Saunders, Board Member John Wood, Board
Member Ignacio Hernaiz

JCAD Staff

Mr. Mitch Fast, Chief Appraiser
Ms. Brittany Vereen, Director of
Appraisal Operations
Ms. Amy Gill, Director of Support Services

1. Preliminary Business

1.A. Call to Order

Chairperson Tina White called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1.B. Determination of a Quorum

A quorum was determined present.

1.C. Welcome

1.D. Invocation

Director Chris Saunders led the invocation.

1.E. Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairperson Peter Svendsen led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.F. Recognitions

1.G. Non-agenda Public Communications

Mr. Michael Ancy addressed the Board and began by thanking the Board members for their service and expressing appreciation for District staff and the work they perform.

Mr. Ancy requested that the Board delay canvassing related to the property located at 240 North Burleson Boulevard, the former Harley-Davidson building. He stated that he believed there may be other suitable facility options available within the District that should be considered before proceeding with the property.

Mr. Ancy expressed concern regarding the location, appearance, and cost of the proposed property, describing it as a prime piece of real estate located along Interstate 35 in Burleson and noting that the building was relatively new. He stated that, in his opinion, purchasing such a property could create a negative perception among taxpayers and noted that several individuals had expressed similar concerns to him. Mr. Ancy clarified that he was speaking solely on his own behalf and was not representing another individual or organization.

Mr. Ancy also expressed concern about relocating the District's office from its current central location in Cleburne to the northern portion of Johnson County. He stated that maintaining a more centrally located office provides greater accessibility for residents throughout the county, including those traveling from communities such as Rio Vista, while still remaining accessible to residents of Burleson. He expressed concern that locating the office near the northern end of the county could place residents in other areas at a disadvantage.

Mr. Ancy acknowledged that the District's existing Cleburne facility is outdated and agreed that it needs to be replaced. He emphasized that his concern was not with the need for a new facility, but rather whether the proposed Burleson property was the appropriate choice. He stated that information regarding the proposed acquisition had only recently become more widely known and that he believed additional opportunities may exist that warrant consideration.

Mr. Ancy concluded by noting that the District anticipated discussions with its taxing entities regarding the proposed acquisition. He suggested that those discussions could also provide an opportunity to address the District's overall facility needs and consider potential alternatives rather than focusing solely on the proposed Burleson property.

Chairperson Tina White thanked Mr. Ancy for his comments. There were no additional non-agenda public communications.

2. Action Items

2.A. Review, discuss and consider taking action to accept the resignation of a member of the Board of Directors.

Chairperson White stated that she had received an email from Director Larry Trammell approximately one month earlier indicating his intention to resign from the Johnson CAD Board of Directors. She stated that Director Trammell subsequently confirmed his intention to resign in a follow-up email dated August 25, 2026.

Chairperson White explained that she had acknowledged the correspondence but that, under the Board's recently adopted policies, a resignation must be formally accepted by the Board. She noted that she could not accept the resignation on behalf of the Board and that formal Board action was therefore required, which was the reason the matter had been placed on

the agenda for the special meeting.

Chairperson White made a motion to accept Director Larry Trammell's resignation from the Board of Directors, effective immediately.

Director Larry Trammell seconded the motion to accept his resignation and proceeded to read his resignation letter into the record.

In his letter, Director Trammell stated that it had been an honor to serve the citizens and taxing entities of Johnson County and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work alongside his fellow Board members and District employees in support of fair, accurate, and professional property appraisal administration.

Director Trammell reflected on his two-year tenure and identified several areas of service and accomplishments of which he was particularly proud. These included his work on the Finance and Budget Committee, New Facility Committee, Chief Appraiser Search, Policies Committee, and Reappraisal Plan Committee. He also referenced the adoption of the District's reappraisal plan and the hiring of a highly qualified Chief Appraiser among the accomplishments he valued during his service.

Director Trammell further stated that, subject to applicable law and the Board's governing policies, he would be willing to continue assisting the District as a non-Board member on these or other Board advisory committees or subcommittees if the Board determined that his continued service would be beneficial. He stated that doing so would allow the District to continue utilizing his years of business experience and his familiarity with matters important to the Board, taxing entities, and Johnson County taxpayers.

Director Trammell concluded by expressing his gratitude for the trust placed in him and wishing the Board, District staff, and the District continued success in fulfilling their responsibilities to the public. He stated that, following the vote on his resignation, the Board could consider a motion regarding his continued service as a non-Board member on applicable subcommittees, as permitted by law.

Chairperson White emphasized that the accomplishments referenced by Director Trammell had occurred during his two years of service on the Board.

Director Trammell stated that the process of identifying and hiring a new Chief Appraiser had taken nearly a year and required considerable work from multiple Board members. He expressed appreciation for the assistance of his fellow Board members throughout that process.

Director Trammell also discussed his work on the facilities subcommittee and stated that it had been a pleasure working with Vice Chairperson Peter Svendsen. He emphasized that the District's need for a new facility was not a recent issue, noting that the Board had been considering options for more than five years and that taxing entities had been advised for approximately ten years that funds were being accumulated toward an eventual facility replacement.

Director Trammell stated that during his approximately one year of service on the facilities

subcommittee, the committee evaluated a dozen or more properties before selecting the property it believed was the most appropriate option available to the District. He encouraged those unfamiliar with the District's existing facility to visit it in order to better understand the need for replacement.

Director Trammell further discussed the financial considerations associated with the proposed facility. He stated that the District had successfully negotiated financing at an interest rate of approximately 5% without issuing bonds and had negotiated a purchase price approximately 20% below the property's asking price. He also stated that, based on the options evaluated by the subcommittee, the proposed facility would cost millions of dollars less than purchasing or constructing a comparable facility in Cleburne.

Director Trammell expressed strong support for the work completed by the facilities subcommittee and emphasized that selecting the proposed property followed an extensive review of available alternatives rather than a short-term decision.

Vice Chairperson Peter Svendsen echoed Director Trammell's comments and emphasized that the Board had taken the search for a new District facility seriously and had worked to identify a financially responsible option for Johnson County taxpayers.

Vice Chairperson Svendsen stated that purchasing land in Cleburne and constructing a facility of the size needed by the District was estimated to cost approximately \$10 million to \$11 million. He stated that the Board was not comfortable pursuing an option at that cost when other alternatives were available.

He recognized the efforts of Chairperson White, Director Trammell, Director Chris Saunders, and Director Jason Marbut in researching and evaluating potential properties. He noted that the Board had extensively searched Cleburne, Joshua, and other areas for suitable options before considering the proposed property.

Vice Chairperson Svendsen also discussed other properties that had been considered or explored. He stated that he had recently spoken with the County Judge regarding the possibility of acquiring the property previously occupied by Scott Porter, but the County was not willing to relinquish or sell the space. He also recalled earlier discussions with the Mayor and City Manager regarding the former First Financial Bank property, which the City ultimately retained and remodeled.

Vice Chairperson Svendsen concluded by emphasizing that the Board had not taken the facility decision lightly and had conducted an extensive search for an appropriate and financially responsible solution.

At this point in the discussion, Mr. Michael Ancy raised a point of order and advised the Board that the agenda item under consideration concerned Director Trammell's resignation. He noted that the Board was discussing matters related to Item C while Item A was currently before the Board.

Following a brief discussion regarding the point of order, Director John Wood thanked Mr. Ancy for bringing the matter to the Board's attention.

Following the discussion, the Board voted on Chairperson White's motion to accept Director Larry Trammell's resignation from the Board of Directors, effective immediately. The motion passed unanimously.

Following the acceptance of Director Trammell's resignation, Chairperson White requested that the Board place an item on its next meeting agenda to discuss the resulting Board vacancy, including the available options, applicable timing, and the process for filling the vacancy. She noted that legal counsel, Mr. Tepper, was expected to attend the next meeting and stated that the Board should have the benefit of legal counsel when discussing the matter.

2.B. Review, discuss and consider taking action on the appointment of a non-Board member to serve on a Board subcommittee.

Chairperson White explained that this related to Mr. Trammell's earlier statement regarding his willingness to continue assisting the District following his resignation from the Board.

Chairperson White noted that Mr. Trammell had been actively involved in several Board committees during his tenure, including matters involving appraisal, budget and finance, and the District's facility. She explained that, based on her experience in local government, it is not uncommon for governing bodies to utilize non-Board members on advisory committees or subcommittees.

Chairperson White stated that the proposed building was currently in escrow and that the final outcome of the acquisition remained uncertain. Because Mr. Trammell had been closely involved in the process, including financing discussions, inspections, and other matters related to the proposed acquisition, she believed his continued participation would help maintain continuity and momentum while the process was completed.

Chairperson White made a motion to appoint Mr. Larry Trammell as a non-Board member of the Building Acquisition Subcommittee to assist with the process through its conclusion. Vice Chairperson Peter Svendsen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson White further stated that the Board may want to consider utilizing non-Board members on future subcommittees when special projects or other needs arise. She suggested that, when appropriate, the District could reach out to its constituents to determine whether individuals may be interested in serving and could offer specialized knowledge, experience, or skills that would be beneficial to the Board and District.

2.C. Review, discuss and consider taking action on the approval of Board of Director representation at taxing entity meetings concerning the proposed building acquisition.

Chairperson White introduced a document titled "Talking Points," which she stated had been developed collaboratively with Mr. Trammell to provide consistent information when communicating with the District's taxing entities regarding the proposed building acquisition. She noted that each taxing entity with voting authority had already received correspondence from Chief Appraiser Mitch Fast, along with a summary containing information regarding the proposed property, including the building details and purchase price.

Chairperson White reported that Mr. Trammell had attended a City of Godley City Council meeting to discuss the matter and that she had attended a Crowley ISD Board meeting. She explained that the proposed building acquisition was not on Crowley ISD's agenda that evening and indicated that the District may consider the matter at its September 10 meeting. She also reminded the Board that if a taxing entity takes no action, the matter is deemed approved.

Chairperson White advised Board members who planned to attend taxing entity meetings, particularly school district meetings, to review each entity's procedures in advance for registering to speak. She explained that requirements vary by entity and may include advance registration or submission of an online request.

Chairperson White also shared that after registering to speak at the Crowley ISD meeting, she was contacted by the District's Chief Financial Officer. During their conversation, questions were raised not only about the proposed building acquisition but also about Johnson CAD's reappraisal plan. She noted that the CFO was pleased to learn that the District had conducted a reappraisal in 2026, planned another reappraisal for 2027, and had revised its plan to a two-year reappraisal cycle. Chairperson White emphasized that taxing entities may not always be aware of recent changes made by the Appraisal District and that Board members should be prepared to answer questions beyond the building acquisition when attending these meetings.

Chairperson White concluded by referring the Board to a separate document listing upcoming taxing entity meeting dates and encouraged members to review the applicable public-comment requirements in advance to ensure they had an opportunity to address the entities.

A question was raised regarding whether an individual Board member could speak with representatives of the District's taxing entities outside of their formal meetings. It was clarified that such communication would be appropriate provided that the taxing entity did not have a quorum of its governing body present.

Chairperson White then discussed several upcoming taxing entity meetings. She noted that the City of Crowley had a meeting scheduled for Thursday evening and had placed the proposed building acquisition on its agenda. She stated that the accompanying staff report did not make a recommendation and that the proposed resolution provided the City Council with the option to either approve or disapprove the acquisition.

Chairperson White also noted that the City of Keene had the matter on its Thursday meeting agenda. She stated that the City's agenda materials indicated that city managers throughout Johnson County had been discussing the proposed acquisition and that the Keene City Manager was recommending that the City Council adopt a resolution disapproving the acquisition.

Chairperson White acknowledged the limited amount of time before the Thursday meetings and stated that the council meetings would provide an opportunity to address the entities directly. She further noted that additional taxing entity meetings were scheduled and would provide further opportunities for Board members to communicate information regarding the

proposed acquisition.

Chairperson White stated that an additional piece of information would be beneficial when Board members communicate with the taxing entities regarding the proposed building acquisition. She suggested providing each entity with an estimate of what its individual contribution would be toward the anticipated debt service or mortgage payments if the property were acquired.

Chairperson White noted that this information had not been included in the materials previously distributed by Mr. Fast but believed it would be helpful when discussing the proposal with the taxing entities, whether during their scheduled meetings or through separate meetings or virtual discussions.

She stated that Mr. Fast had prepared information showing the estimated financial impact to the individual taxing entities for the Board's review and use during those discussions.

Chief Appraiser Mitch Fast explained the spreadsheet distributed to the Board, which provided estimated financial impacts to the taxing entities associated with the proposed building acquisition. He stated that the allocation percentages were based on the same methodology used in the District's adopted 2027 budget and relied on the most recent available levy information from 2025. He noted that 2026 levy information was not yet available and that the percentages could change once tax rates were established.

Mr. Fast explained that the spreadsheet grouped school districts, cities, and other taxing entities separately and identified each entity's percentage of the total levy. Among the school districts, Burleson ISD represented approximately 13.22% of the total levy, followed by Cleburne ISD at approximately 10.64%. Among the cities, Burleson represented the largest percentage, followed by Cleburne. Johnson County represented the largest overall individual allocation at approximately 21.55%. Hill College was also included in the calculations.

Mr. Fast explained that the spreadsheet illustrated the estimated effect of increases of \$100,000, \$500,000, and \$600,000 to the District's budget. For example, based on the current allocation percentages, a \$100,000 budget increase would result in an estimated annual increase of approximately \$13,222 for Burleson ISD. A \$500,000 increase would result in an estimated contribution of approximately \$66,112, while a \$600,000 increase would result in approximately \$79,335.

Mr. Fast stated that the \$500,000 estimate was intended to represent the approximate annual debt service associated with the proposed building acquisition, based on the anticipated interest rate and a 20-year financing term. The additional \$100,000 was included as a possible estimate for increased operating expenses associated with the facility, including utilities, landscaping, and similar costs. For planning purposes, he stated that the combined \$600,000 figure could therefore be used to illustrate the potential annual budget impact of the facility.

The spreadsheet also converted the estimated \$600,000 annual increase into quarterly amounts. Mr. Fast stated that Burleson ISD's estimated quarterly increase would be approximately \$19,834, while Johnson County's estimated quarterly increase would be

approximately \$32,325.

Mr. Fast also reviewed the approval requirements associated with the proposed acquisition. He stated that there were 26 taxing entities and explained that a three-fourths approval requirement would require approval from 20 entities. Based on that calculation, 19 approvals would not be sufficient, and seven entities voting to disapprove would be enough to prevent the proposal from meeting the required approval threshold and require the District to reconsider or reconfigure the plan.

Mr. Fast concluded by explaining that the adopted 2027 budget was structured so that the proposed building costs would not affect the entities' 2027 contributions. Instead, the estimates were intended primarily as a planning tool for the taxing entities as they prepared for the 2028 budget year. He noted that the District's normal 2028 budget planning process would begin around March or April 2027.

Director Ignacio Hernaiz clarified that the estimated increase in a taxing entity's contribution to the Appraisal District would not necessarily result directly in a tax increase. He noted that an entity could potentially absorb the additional cost by reallocating funds within its existing budget, although the increased expense could also contribute to a tax increase depending on the individual entity's budgetary circumstances.

Director Hernaiz asked how much the taxing entities were currently contributing to the Appraisal District's budget, using Burleson ISD as an example. Mr. Fast responded that Burleson ISD's current contribution was approximately \$732,200.

Director Hernaiz noted that, based on the estimated additional contribution previously discussed, Burleson ISD's contribution would increase by approximately 10%.

Mr. Trammell stated that there were several moving parts to consider when evaluating the overall financial impact of the proposed building acquisition. He acknowledged that the District would incur an increased expense associated with the mortgage; however, he noted that acquiring a facility with adequate space would also eliminate certain existing expenses, including the cost of renting a separate location for Board of Directors meetings and renting additional space for parking.

Chairperson White noted the differing approaches reflected in the agenda materials of the two cities, with one city's staff presenting the matter without a recommendation and another city's staff making a recommendation to its governing body.

She emphasized the importance of Board members attending taxing entity meetings when possible to provide information directly and answer questions regarding the proposed acquisition. Chairperson White noted that the governing bodies of the taxing entities may not necessarily be receiving all of the relevant information through their finance directors or administrative staff, making direct communication with the entities particularly important.

Vice Chairperson Svendsen discussed another property previously considered by the District, the WellMed building. He stated that although the property was viewed favorably, the

owners were unwilling to sell it to the District. The available option would have required a long-term lease, which the Board did not believe was in the best financial interest of the taxpayers because the District would not ultimately own the property.

Vice Chairperson Svendsen contrasted that option with the proposed building acquisition, noting that the financing for the proposed property would be paid off within 15 years and that the District also had existing capital available to assist with the acquisition.

He further stated that Mr. Maddox had received a letter from legal counsel Matthew Tepper regarding the District's current building. Vice Chairperson Svendsen explained that the letter addressed Mr. Maddox's right of first refusal to purchase the current building at market value, which could provide additional financial benefit and help offset a portion of the facility costs.

The Board discussed coordinating attendance at upcoming taxing entity meetings. Board members considered their individual schedules as well as any existing relationships or familiarity they had with particular taxing entities when determining which meetings they would attend. The discussion was intended to help ensure that, when possible, Board members were present to provide information and respond to questions regarding the proposed building acquisition.

Chairperson White asked Board members to email both her and Mr. Fast regarding the taxing entity meetings they planned to attend and the results of those meetings so that the District could keep track of each entity's response.

She noted that if seven taxing entities voted to disapprove the proposed acquisition, the District would need to regroup and consider its next steps. Chairperson White emphasized that even if the proposal did not receive the necessary approval, the District's need for a replacement facility would remain.

Chairperson White referenced information contained in the City of Keene's staff report indicating that Johnson County city managers had been discussing the proposal. She stated that if the taxing entities believed there had not been sufficient collaboration regarding a potential facility solution, then receiving seven or more disapprovals could provide an opportunity for the District to approach those entities and work collaboratively toward an alternative solution.

She further noted that her understanding was that the applicable requirements differed between purchasing and leasing a facility, and that leasing could remain an option if the proposed purchase did not move forward. If the District wished to pursue another property purchase in the future, she suggested that working more closely with the taxing entities to identify a mutually acceptable solution could be the appropriate next step.

Chairperson White concluded the discussion by identifying an additional point that she believed would be beneficial to emphasize when speaking with the taxing entities. She noted that Appraisal District employees perform an essential, state-mandated function upon which every taxing entity relies. She emphasized that the appraisal work performed by District staff is necessary to support the property tax process and the revenues upon which the taxing

entities depend.

Chairperson White further emphasized that the working conditions and facility needs of District employees should be considered as part of the discussion regarding a replacement facility.

Director John Wood provided the Board with photographs showing the interior of the Appraisal District's current facility. The materials were presented to illustrate the existing working conditions and provide additional context regarding the District's need for a replacement facility.

No formal action was taken by the Board on this item. Board members agreed to coordinate their attendance at upcoming taxing entity meetings and provide Chairperson White and Mr. Fast with updates regarding the meetings they planned to attend and the results of those meetings.

3. Executive Session

Pursuant to Sections 551.071 (Consultation with Attorney), 551.072 (Deliberation Regarding Real Property), 551.074 (Personnel Matters), and 551.076 (Deliberation Regarding Security Devices or Audits) of the Texas Government Code, the Board of Directors reserves the right to convene in Executive Session(s) as deemed necessary during the course of this meeting for any posted agenda item.

The Board did not convene into Executive Session.

3.A. Reconvene into Open Session

3.B. Discuss and possibly take action on anything discussed in Executive Session including property owner complaints and personnel matters.

4. Closing Business

4.A. Future Agenda Items

Board of Directors vacancy

4.B. Proposed Next Meeting Date: September 10, 2026

The Board discussed the previously scheduled September 10, 2026 meeting and determined that several Board members would be unable to attend, resulting in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Fast also discussed future scheduling and suggested that a meeting toward the end of September could be beneficial, as Parkhill, the firm assisting the District with the building acquisition and facility evaluation, could potentially have its report completed by that time.

After discussing availability, the Board agreed to schedule its next meeting for Friday, September 25, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. Chairperson White requested that the updated meeting date and time be posted on the District's website.

4.C. Adjourn

Chairperson White made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

Approved the 1st day of October, 2026.



Chairperson



Secretary