

The Board of County Commissioners of Walton County, Florida, met in regular adjourned session on this Saturday, Nov. 24th, 1928, pursuant to adjournment of Nov. 20th, 1928, with the following members present and participating, - W I Stinson, Chairman, W M Infinger, G M Bishop, R L Jones and J J Ward, and M T Fountain, Clerk of said Board.

The following proceedings were had and done.

Due notice having been given as required by Law that this Board would receive sealed bids on this day for the purpose of furnishing of material and building a timber piling bridge over and across White Creek on Project No.9, approximately 160 ft. long, according to plans and specifications to be on file in Clerk's office on and after Nov. 19th, 1928, and in pursuance thereto the following bids or proposals was filed or presented to the said board which was considered pro and con,-

Creosoted timber \$120.00 per MFEM., 12¹/₂ Trt.12" Butt Creosoted \$1.20 per Lin. ft.

For untreated cypress or pine 75% Heart \$98.00 per M,

H. Bludworth,

Caps			
1500 FEM/@ per MFEM	\$80.00	12 ¹ / ₂ Treatment, Cypress	\$78.00
5000 " Joists @ "	\$80.00	75% Heart	\$65.00
1500 " Planking "	\$79.00	Pine	\$65.00
4700 " Flooring@"	\$79.00		\$65.00
9400 " " "	79.00		\$65.00
1100 Ft. Piling " per Ft.	78cts		70Cts

Cobb and Helton.

22000 Ft. B.M. Creosoted Timber	@	\$115.00	per M. Ft.
22000 Ft. B.M. Untreated Pine	@	\$88.00	per M. "
22000 Ft. B.M. Cypress	@@	\$88.00	per M. "
1100 Creosoted Piling	@	\$1.10	
1100 Untreated Pine 85%		--	
2100 Lin. Ft. Cypress piling		--	

Penson-Mathis Const. Co

After opening the the above and foregoing bids, thereupon, upon motion of G M Bishop seconded by J J Ward and duly carried by unanimous vote, it was ordered that the Board retire into executive session.

The Board then considered the above and foregoing bids pro and con upon motion of Commissioner J J Ward, seconded by Commissioner G M Bishop and duly carried by unanimous vote it was ordered that the above bids on Project #9 be and the same is hereby rejected because all the bids are un-satisfactory, and

Further ordered that due notice be published in the issues of the DeFuniak Herald that this Board would receive sealed bids until 2 o'clock P.M., Dec. 22nd, 1928, on this same project with same provisions as contained in the notice for bids.

The Bids received by this Board on Nov. 13th, 1928 from G W Byrd on Projects #10 & #11 was then considered and upon motion of G M Bishop, seconded by W M Infinger and duly carried by unanimous vote, it was ordered that the bids of G W Byrd on Projects #10 & #11 be rejected because the bids are unsatisfactory, and further ordered that the Clerk of this Board returns to the respective bidders on Projects #9, 10 & 11, their checks deposited with their Bids.

Hon. D. Stuart Gillis, County Attorney being before the Board then presented the following proposition in words and figures following to-wit:-

D. STUART GILLIS,
Lawyer
DeFuniak Springs, Florida. November 12, 1928.

The County Commissioners, Walton County, Florida.

Gentlemen:- The fee which I was to receive for the validation of the \$1,250,000 Road and Bridge Bonds was one to be agreed upon between us.

I propose to accept three-quarters of one per cent of the issue --\$9,375, although my information is that this is one-quarter of one per cent less than the fees paid in Osceola, Brevard, Bay, Polk, Palm Beach, St. Johns, Leon, St. Lucie, Indian River and Duval Counties, one per cent, and more in some instances, being the fee in these and other counties of the State for such services--even when the cases are concluded in the Circuit Court. In this

case, as you know, I was not only compelled to go the Supreme Court of the State, but made every preparation to go to the United States Supreme Court to which an appeal was perfected.

In considering this proposal, I hope you will bear in mind the fact that I have expended considerable time and effort--and some money--in connection with this bond issue and others of which it was a part so far as our contracts were concerned, for none of which do I make any charge--if this proposal is agreeable to and accepted by you.

It is also to be understood that in the event the above proposal is not agreed to by you, it is to be considered with-drawn, and that I shall be at liberty to insist upon one per cent, the average fee for such services, and that I shall also claim the contract fee and reasonable compensation for services in this connection other than the validation suit.

Yours respectfully,

DSG/C

D. Stuart Gillis.

After some discussion the following resolution was adopted,-

Upon motion of Commissioner G M Bishop, seconded by Commissioner R L Jones, it was ordered that the proposal of D. Stuart Gillis, Attorney for the Board in the validation in the courts of the \$1,250,000 road and bridge bonds, to accept the sum of \$9,375,00 for his fee therein, be accepted and agreed to and that warrant or check be drawn therefor against the funds derived from the sale of said bonds, and delivered to the said attorney, it being understood that said sum is in full payment for all services rendered by said attorney in connection with the issuance and sale of said bonds and the legal proceedings incident thereto of whatsoever nature, including toll bridge bond issue.

The vote upon the motion was as follows: For the motion:- G M Bishop, R L Jones, J J Ward and W I Stinson.

Against the motion:- W. M. Infinger.

Mr Gillis was then asked what he would condemn the right-of-ways for the use of public roads in the county for, and he advised the Board that he would condemn property for the use of a public highway for one half of what the Court and Jury allowed the attorney or attorneys of the defendant.

Then Board then adjourned until Wednesday afternoon, Nov. 28th, 1928.