CIVIL COURTS PROJECT PRESENTATION - 8:00 A.M.
to be followed by
REGULAR COURT

REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUESTS

1) Civil Courts Project Presentation ........................................ N/A

2) HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
   a) FY 2001-2002 Ryan White Title II Funds Contract Awards ......... 4-5
   b) Transfer of Grant Funded Vehicles ................................... 6-9
      (COURT ORDER ON FORMAL AGENDA)
   c) Texas Weatherization Assistance Program .......................... 10-12

3) SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT
   FY 2002 North Texas Auto Theft Task Force .......................... 13-19
4) **DATA SERVICES/SCT-IT**

Contracts for Data Services between:

i) Verifacts Incorporated and Dallas County .......... 20-26

ii) Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law and Dallas County .......... 27-33

5) **MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

Convenience Fees for Website .......... 34-37

6) **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

a) Dallas County Employees Credit Union Lease Renewal .......... 38-40
   (COURT ORDER ON FORMAL AGENDA - Rebrief)

b) Renewal Lease - Community Supervision and Corrections Satellite Office, 3650 North Buckner, Dallas Texas .......... 41-53

7) **PURCHASING DEPARTMENT**

Request for Proposals for Third Party Claims Administration Services for Dallas County Self-insurance Workers Compensation Program RFP No. 2001-108-850 .......... 54-64

8) **PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**


9) **OPERATIONS**

Change Order to Architectural Services Contract for Old Red Courthouse Preservation Project with James Pratt Architecture Urban Design, Inc. .......... 68-75
10) PERSONNEL/CIVIL SERVICE
Renewal of Reinsurance for Self-insured Medical Benefits Plans ........ 76-81

11) OFFICE OF BUDGET & EVALUATION
Request for New Positions in the Grants Division (Health & Human Services) ......................... 82-91

12) STAFF
Contract Jail Health and Development of a secure Jail Health Impatient/Outpatient Facility ......................... 92-95

13) JP, Precinct 8 Staffing, Budget and Operations Discussion .............. N/A

14) Legislation Issues ............................................. N/A

15) Redistricting .................................................. N/A

16) Tax Consolidation Update .................................... N/A

17) Miscellaneous, Travel Requests, Miscellaneous Equipment, and Telecommunications Requests ......................... 96-100

FIVE SIGNATURE DOCUMENT(s) FOR CONSIDERATION

Minister’s Letter of Appreciation

DATE(s) TO REMEMBER

** April 17, 2001 @ 3:00 p.m. - Civil Courts Project Steering Committee Meeting

** April 20, 2001 @ 9:00 a.m. - Legislative Briefing - Commissioners Courtroom
TO: HONORABLE COMMISSIONERS COURT
FROM: BETTY J. CULBREATH-LISTER, DIRECTOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DATE: APRIL 11, 2001
SUBJECT: FY 2001-2002 RYAN WHITE TITLE II FUNDS CONTRACT AWARDS

Background of Issue
The Dallas County Judge is the grantee and legal recipient of Ryan White Title II Funds and Dallas County Health and Human Services (DCHHS) is designated to serve as the Administrative Agency for Ryan White Title II funds for the Dallas Health Services Delivery Area (HSDA), which includes Dallas, Collin, Cooke, Denton, Ellis, Fannin, Grayson, Hunt, Kaufman, Navarro, and Rockwall counties. In accordance with the provisions of Title II of the Ryan White CARE Act, the Dallas HSDA HIV Services Consortium is charged with the responsibility of establishing priorities for the allocation of Title II funds and determining the categorical allocation of funds by service category. The Administrative Agency tracks the expenditure of funds by the service providers throughout the year and makes recommendations, when appropriate, to reallocate funds.

Fiscal Impact
The Administrative Agency has received the FY 2001-2002 Ryan White Title II contract for an award amount of $2,054,574. Of the FY 2001-2002 Ryan White Title II award, $201,325 is designated by the grantor, the Texas Department of Health, to be contracted on a sole source basis for services to eligible individuals residing in Cooke, Fannin, Grayson, and Navarro counties.

Of the $201,325 Ryan White Title II award available to subcontract with specific service providers to serve clients in Cooke, Fannin, Grayson, and Navarro counties, $171,901 is being recommended for contract approval to provide services to eligible clients residing in Cooke, Fannin and Grayson counties through AIDS Resource Center of Texoma, Inc.

Of the $201,325 Ryan White Title II award, the remaining balance of $29,424 will be designated for sole source contract to provide services to individuals in Navarro county. Contracts and budgets for these funds will be submitted to Commissioners Court under separate briefing and court order for these allocated funds.

Operational Impact
Administrative Agency staff will coordinate and monitor the programmatic and fiscal accountability of the subcontractors in accordance with the responsibilities assigned by Commissioners Court. The programmatic and fiscal contract compliance will be reviewed by Administrative Agency staff who are specifically assigned the responsibility of conducting compliance audits of the HIV services sub-grantees. The administrative award from this grant provides the funds for these positions through the Administrative Agency budget.

Legal Impact
The signature of the County Judge is required on the FY2001-2002 Ryan White Title II contracts.

2377 Stemmons Freeway Dallas, Texas 75207-2710 Office (214) 819-1842
Suite 200 LB-16 FAX (214) 819-1850
Recommendation
It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve the recommendation of the Administrative Agency on the award of FY 2001-2002 Ryan White Title II funds in the amount of $171,901 to AIDS Resource Center of Texoma, Inc. to provide services to eligible individuals residing in Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson counties, and authorize the County Judge to sign the contract with the service provider named herein on behalf of Dallas County.

RECOMMENDED BY:  
[Signature]  
Betty J. Cubreath-Lister, Director Health and Human Services

c:  
J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator  
Virginia Porter, County Auditor
THE HONORABLE COMMISSIONERS COURT

BETTY J. CULBREATH-LISTER, DIRECTOR

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

APRIL 10, 2000

SUBJECT: RATIONALE FOR SAME DATE BRIEFING AND COURT ORDER

The rationale for briefing and court ordering this item on formal agenda is to ensure that services to persons living with HIV/AIDS are not disrupted. The four vehicles previously held by the Bethlehem Foundation had been used to provide transportation services to persons living with HIV/AIDS in the southwestern quadrant of Dallas County – particularly Oak Cliff, DeSoto, Cedar Hill, and Grand Prairie.

All clients previously served by the Bethlehem Foundation’s transportation services are being transferred to new agencies. This shift in clients from the Bethlehem Foundation to other funded transportation providers will cause a higher demand on the latter. In order to meet this higher demand, it is imperative that the vehicles previously held by the Bethlehem Foundation be transferred to the other funded transportation providers. It is particularly imperative that Johnnie’s Manor receives another vehicle -- since they will be providing transportation services to the vast majority of the Bethlehem Foundation’s former transportation clients. Thus it is recommended that both the briefing and court order be allowed during the April 17, 2001 Court session.

c: J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator

A: 2001_vantransferRationale.wpd

2377 Stemmons Freeway Dallas, Texas 75207-2710
Suite 200 LB-16
Office (214) 819-1842
FAX (214) 819-1850
TO: COMMISSIONERS COURT
FROM: BETTY J. CULBREATH-LISTER, DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 10, 2000
SUBJECT: TRANSFER OF GRANT FUNDED VEHICLES  (Court Order On Formal Agenda)

Background of Issue
The Dallas County Judge is the grantee and legal recipient of Ryan White Title I funds, Ryan White Title II funds, and State of Texas HIV Health and Social Services (State Services) funds. And Dallas County Health and Human Services (DCHHS) is designated as the Administrative Agency for these funds in the Dallas service area.

On February 28, 2001, all remaining contracts between DCHHS and the Bethlehem Foundation expired. The Bethlehem Foundation, which had previously been funded to provide transportation services to persons living with HIV/AIDS in the Dallas service area, had in its possession four vehicles that had been purchased through the above-mentioned HIV/AIDS grant funds. In accordance with Section 7, Subsection E(5) of the Ryan White Title I, Ryan White Title II, and State Services contracts, entitled “Equipment and Supplies”. DCHHS is requesting that the four grant-funded vehicles be transferred to other contractors that are currently funded to provide transportation services in the Dallas service area. The proper signature(s) is being requested to transfer the titles of the following two vehicles from the Bethlehem Foundation to AIDS Services of North Texas (ASNT) and Johnnie’s Manor, Inc., respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Title Holder</th>
<th>Make/Model</th>
<th>VIN Number</th>
<th>New Title Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bethlehem Foundation</td>
<td>1999 Ford</td>
<td>#1F8SS3ALXXHC34269</td>
<td>ASNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bethlehem Foundation</td>
<td>1997 Ford</td>
<td>#1FDKE30L5VH888119</td>
<td>Johnnie’s Manor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By transferring the titles of these two vehicles, DCHHS will ensure that there is no disruption in transportation services to persons living with HIV/AIDS that would otherwise occur due to the contract cancellation with the Bethlehem Foundation.

2377 Stemmons Freeway Dallas, Texas 75207-2710 Office (214) 819-1842
Suite 200 LB-16 FAX (214) 819-1850
The proper signature(s) is also being requested to transfer the titles of the following two inoperative vehicles from the Bethlehem Foundation to Dallas County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Title Holder</th>
<th>Make/Model</th>
<th>VIN Number</th>
<th>New Title Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bethlehem Foundation</td>
<td>1994 Ford</td>
<td>#1FTFE21413RHC00814</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bethlehem Foundation</td>
<td>1994 Pontiac</td>
<td>#GMDU06L7RT216829</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By transferring the title of these two vehicles, DCHHS will be guaranteeing that the equipment is adequately insured until proper disposal can be arranged.

**Fiscal Impact**
There will be no fiscal impact on the County.

**Operational Impact**
The Administrative Agency’s staff will coordinate and monitor the programmatic and fiscal accountability of the contractors in accordance with the responsibilities assigned by the Commissioners Court. The programmatic aspect of contract compliance will be reviewed by Administrative Agency’s program monitors and the fiscal aspect of contract compliance will be reviewed by Dallas County auditors, who are specifically assigned the responsibility of conducting fiscal audits of the HIV services sub-grantees.

**Legal Impact**
The signature of the County Judge is required on the vehicle titles, and the Commissioners Court must approve the transfer of vehicles.

**Recommendation**
It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve the recommendation of the Administrative Agency for the transfer of the following vehicles formerly held by the Bethlehem Foundation and identified by the provided VIN numbers to the respective agencies: VIN #1F8SS3ALXXHC34269 to AIDS Services of North Texas; VIN #1FDKE30L5VH888119 to Johnnie’s Manor; and the inoperative vehicles identified by VIN #1FTFE21413RHC00814 and VIN #GMDU06L7RT216829 to Dallas County until proper disposal can be arranged, and authorize the County Judge to sign the titles for transfer of all of the above-referenced vehicles.

RECOMMENDED BY: Betty J. Culbreath-Lister, Director, Health and Human Services

C: J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator
Virginia Porter, County Auditor
ORDER NO. 

DATE: 

STATE OF TEXAS $ $ 
COUNTY OF DALLAS $ $ 

BE IT REMEMBERED, at a regular meeting of Commissioners' Court of Dallas County, Texas held on the ______ day of __________________ 2001, on motion made by ________________________ and seconded by ________________________, the following Order was adopted:

WHEREAS, the transfer of vehicles from the Bethlehem Foundation to Ryan White Title I and II funded agencies by the Administrative Agency for these funds was discussed in Commissioners Court on April 17, 2001; and

WHEREAS, on February 28, 2001, all remaining contracts between DCHHS and the Bethlehem Foundation expired; and

WHEREAS, the proper signature is required to transfer the following vehicles formerly held by the Bethlehem Foundation to the respective agencies: VIN #1F8SS3ALXXHC34269 to AIDS Services of North Texas; VIN #1FDKE30L5VH888119 to Johnnie’s Manor; and two vehicles identified by VIN #1FTFE21413RHC00814 and #GMDU06L7RT216829 to Dallas County.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court does hereby approve the transfer of the following vehicles formerly held by the Bethlehem Foundation to the respective agencies: VIN #1F8SS3ALXXHC34269 to AIDS Services of North Texas; VIN #1FDKE30L5VH888119 to Johnnie’s Manor, and VIN #1FTFE21413RHC00814 and #GMDU06L7RT216829 to Dallas County, and authorize the County Judge to sign the necessary title documentation on behalf of Dallas County.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this the ______ day of ____________________________ 2001.

Lee F. Jackson
County Judge

Jim Jackson
Commissioner, District No. 1

Mike Cantrell
Commissioner, District No. 2

John Wiley Price
Commissioner, District No. 3

Kenneth A. Mayfield
Commissioner, District No. 4

Recommended by: Betty Culbreath-Lister, Director, Health and Human Services
TO:        COMMISSIONERS COURT
FROM:      Betty Culbreath-Lister, Director
DATE:      April 17, 2001
SUBJECT:   TEXAS WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) has awarded Dallas County Health and Human Services the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) contracts for Dallas County. They are as follows: (1) DOE and (2) LIHEAP.

The WAP contract period is April 1, 2001 through March 31, 2002. The WAP will weatherize 233 low-income homes in Dallas County. The weatherization work will include: caulking, weatherstripping, ceiling insulation, replacing and repairing of doors and windows, patching holes in the building envelopes, roof repair, and insulating inefficient water heaters. The program also funds tuneup, repair, or replacement of unhealthy heating and cooling appliances.

OPERATIONS IMPACT

Health and Human Services will administer the program with (5) five full-time employees. Staff funded under this contract includes: (1) one Coordinator, (3) three Assessors, (1) one Part-time Assistant Assessor, and (1) one Clerk V. The department will process all payments through the County Auditor’s office.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

TDHCA will fully fund this program with contracted funds totaling $639,319. Of this amount, $594,792 is allocated for direct services, $1,500 for insurance, $800 for single audit, $800 for training and technical assistance, and $41,427 is available for administration costs.
LEGAL IMPACT

The contract from TDHCA requires the approval of the Commissioners' Court and the signature of the County Judge. TDHCA plans to execute the weatherization program contract electronically.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Dallas County Commissioners' approve the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) contract with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs in the amount of $639,319, and authorize the County Judge to electronically sign the related contract documents on behalf of Dallas County.

Recommended by: Betty Culbreath-Lister, Director

attachments

c: J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator
Virginia Porter, County Auditor
Ryan Brown, Acting Budget Officer
Bill Melton, County Treasurer
## 2001 Budget Weatherization Program Through TDHCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Items</th>
<th>DOE Budget</th>
<th>LIHEAP Budget</th>
<th>Stripper Well/Occ. Budget</th>
<th>TXU Elec. Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract Dollars</td>
<td>$287,451.00</td>
<td>$337,481.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$624,932.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$23,665.00</td>
<td>$17,762.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,427.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (Total Program $)</td>
<td>$261,486.00</td>
<td>$319,719.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$581,205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Dollars</td>
<td>$261,486.00</td>
<td>$319,719.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$581,205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>$28,665.00</td>
<td>$31,972.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,637.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Program Dollars</td>
<td>$232,821.00</td>
<td>$287,747.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$520,568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Technical Assistance</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material/Program Support/Labor</td>
<td>$232,021.00</td>
<td>$287,747.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$519,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Material Dollars</td>
<td>$92,808.00</td>
<td>$115,099.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,907.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$69,606.00</td>
<td>$86,324.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Program Support</td>
<td>$69,607.00</td>
<td>$86,324.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Support</td>
<td>$261,486.00</td>
<td>$319,719.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$581,205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,387.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,387.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$287,451.00</td>
<td>$351,868.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$639,319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Exp. Per Unit</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,085.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max No. of Units</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TXU Electric Weatherization Piggyback Program’s Contract is Pending
TO: Dallas County Commissioners Court
FROM: L. DeVaney, Captain, North Texas Auto Theft Task Force
THROUGH: Channels
SUBJECT: FY2002 North Texas Auto Theft Task Force Briefing

Background Information

Since 1993 the Texas Auto Theft Prevention Authority has been providing grant funding for the Dallas County Commercial Auto Theft Task Force. On September 1, 1998 the Task Force changed its name to the North Texas Auto Theft Task Force and began to work as a multi-county task force aimed at reducing auto theft in the North Texas area.

Dallas County’s current grant ends August 31, 2001. The Task Force is now applying for its ninth year of funding and the application is due May 1, 2001. The purpose of this briefing is to review the current grant application for the Court and to make a recommendation regarding submission of the continuation application.

Financial Impact/Considerations

The grant does not require a cash or in-kind match. However, the County’s application shows the in-kind match in order to show total project. The sources of the in-kind match are the salaries, benefits, travel, training, vehicles and maintenance of vehicles of DPS troopers, paid by DPS and the salary and benefits, vehicle and maintenance of the NICB Agent, paid for by the NICB. Also, this year we are including 20% of the Project Director’s (Assistant Chief/Dallas Sheriff) salary and benefits as he does oversee and is ultimately responsible for the Task Force. Indirect cost recovery is not allowed.

It is expected that the County can continue to apply for funding for future years as there is currently no limit to the number of years that a grantee may apply.

Funding

The Texas Automobile Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) was established by the legislature in 1991
and is funded through a $1.00 fee assessed on all vehicle insurance policies in Texas. From those fees they award almost 30 grants all over the state for the purpose of reducing auto theft in Texas. These grants pay all costs relating to the Task Force and there is no cost to Dallas County.

Legal Impact

The Task Force as always remained well within all legal margins of local, state and federal laws. At all times the laws and rights governing all peace officers are adhered too ensuring all citizens are protected according to the laws of the land.

Program Results

Table I provides historical trends of the key success measures of the program: vehicles recovered, arrests and dispositions. As can be seen, recent results show a trend toward a smaller number of arrests and dispositions due to the larger coverage area and the removal of prosecutors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY-2000 the Task Force held 54 meetings and/or presentations for and estimated 5,116,598 people. This time obviously took officers away from the task of recovering stolen vehicles and prosecutions. These meetings/presentations are mandated by the ATPA as part of the grant agreement.

Year 2002 Grant Application

For FY-2002, the Sheriff's Office is requesting an increase in grant funds from $683,000 to $990,584, as shown in Table II. The following Table reflects two additional Dallas County Detectives and related equipment plus projected salary increases for the salaries of member agencies.
Table II
Comparison of FY2001 Grant with FY2002 Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Current FY-2001</th>
<th>Proposed FY-2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$480,953</td>
<td>$713,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>13,320</td>
<td>$13,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Supplies and Direct Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$188,727</td>
<td>$263,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Budget</td>
<td>$683,000</td>
<td>$990,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel

Table III provides a comparison of the positions requested in the FY-2001 versus the current grant. The FY-2001 grant requests two additional Sheriff's Deputies. Table IV compares the salary costs of the two years.

Table III
Comparison of FY-2001 Grant-Funded Personnel with FY-2002 Grant-Funded Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY-2001 PERSONNEL</th>
<th>FY-2002 PERSONNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Task Force Commander (Sheriff Captain)</td>
<td>1 Task Force Commander (Sheriff Captain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Denton County Investigator</td>
<td>1 Denton County Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ellis County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Ellis County Deputy Sheriff (Sergeant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rockwall County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Rockwall County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Collin County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Collin County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kaufman County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Kaufman County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff (Senior Sergeant)</td>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff (Senior Sergeant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Secretary / Receptionist</td>
<td>1 Secretary / Receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>1 Dallas County Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The salaries in Table IV are based on actual salary of an individual. A pay raise, anticipated for the grant (projected cost of living, insurance, merit, etc.) has been built into the salaries of all grant-funded task force members. Overtime funds are available for use on joint operations where all task force members are involved. All members are eligible for those funds except the Captain and Assistant Chief.

**Table IV**

**Comparison of FY-2001 Salary cost with FY-2002 Salary cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF POSITION</th>
<th>FY-2001</th>
<th>FY-2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Commander</td>
<td>$62,766</td>
<td>$70,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Sr. Sergeant</td>
<td>$54,622</td>
<td>$53,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Detective</td>
<td>$47,124</td>
<td>$46,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton County DA Investigator</td>
<td>$37,704</td>
<td>$41,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis County Sergeant</td>
<td>$32,492</td>
<td>$40,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall County Investigator</td>
<td>$32,314</td>
<td>$38,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin County Investigator</td>
<td>$42,300</td>
<td>$54,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman County Sergeant*</td>
<td>$15,020</td>
<td>$29,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary Receptionist</td>
<td>$28,103</td>
<td>$28,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Detective (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$93,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected FY-2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits - FICA</td>
<td>$28,577</td>
<td>$41,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits - Retirement</td>
<td>$31,319</td>
<td>$38,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits - Insurance</td>
<td>$30,486</td>
<td>$56,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits - Workers Comp. ADD. Uniform, Other</td>
<td>$30,126</td>
<td>$62,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$480,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>$713,771</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kaufman County / 6 months in FY2000

**Equipment**

Table V compares equipment requests in FY2002 with the current FY2001 equipment requests. The majority of the increases are due to the addition of two Dallas County Detectives.
Table V

Comparison of FY2002 Equipment request with FY2001 Equipment requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment, Supplies and Direct Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY2001</th>
<th>FY2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease of Equipment</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maint. &amp; Operating</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>$25,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Lease</td>
<td>$84,230</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pager Lease</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Police Computer Use</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTCB Database Use</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Phone</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$20,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential (buy) Funds</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$4,838</td>
<td>$5,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of Storage Bay</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$4,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. Box</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Supplies</td>
<td>$5,545</td>
<td>$13,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Items</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Tools</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Digital Computer Use</td>
<td>$4,998</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fee's</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Equipment Purchases</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>$24,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$188,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>$263,493</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Court grant approval of the FY2002 grant application submitted by the North Texas Auto Theft Task Force. The total amount requested from the ATPA for this grant is $990,584.00.

Recommended by:

[Signature]
Lee DeVaney
Captain / Commander / N.T.A.T.T.F.
ORDER NO. 

DATE: 

STATE OF TEXAS 

COUNTY OF DALLAS 

BE IT REMEMBERED, at the regular meeting of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County, Texas, held on the _____ Day of _________, 2001, on the motion made by _____________________________ and seconded by _____________________________, the following Order was adopted:

WHEREAS, the North Texas Auto Theft Task Force FY2002 grant award was briefed to Commissioners Court on April 17, 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Auto Theft Task Force is a specialized multi-county response to auto theft that includes Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Kaufman and Rockwall Counties; and

WHEREAS, the grant award is for the ninth year of funding in the amount of 990,584 grant funds, with an in-kind match provided by participating agencies and Dallas County in the amount of 266,392; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Commissioners Court to continue this program

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court approves acceptance of the North Texas Auto Theft Task Force grant award from the Automobile Prevention Authority for $990,584.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorizes the County Judge to sign all related documents.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this the _____ Day of _________, 2001.

Lee F. Jackson
Dallas County Judge

Jim Jackson
Commissioner, District No. 1

Mike Cantrell
Commissioner, District No. 2

John Wiley Price
Commissioner, District No. 3

Kenneth A. Mayfield
Commissioner, District No. 4

Recommended by:

Lee DeVaney
Captain, N T A.T.T.F. / Sheriff
### Automobile Theft Assistance

**Applicant Information**
- **Legal Name:** Dallas County
- **Address:** 411 Elm Street, 2nd Floor, Dallas, Texas 75202
- **State Payee Identification Number:** 175600090500

**Type of Application**
- New
- Continuation

**Organized Unit:** Dallas County Sheriff's Department

**Name and telephone number of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**
- **Lee DeVaney**
- 214-653-3430 or 214-653-3433

**Title of Project:** North Texas Auto Theft Task Force

**Areas of Project Activities:** Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Rockwall, and Kaufman County

**Funding Summary**
- **Total State Grant Funds Requested (ATPA):** $990,584
- **Cash Match:** $0
- **In-Kind Match:** $266,392
- **Total:** $1,256,976

**Proposed Project**
- **Start Date:** 09-01-2001
- **Ending Date:** 08-31-2002

**Name of Grantor Agency:** Texas Automobile Theft Prevention Authority

**Address:** 4000 Jackson Avenue, Austin, Texas 78779-0001

**Is the applicant delinquent on any federal debt?**
- **YES**
- **NO**

**Is application subject to review by state executive order 12372 process?**
- **YES:**
  - This application was made available to the Texas Review and Comment System (TRACS) for review on [Date]
- **NO**
  - Program is not covered by E.O. 12372
  - Program has not been selected by state for review

**To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this application is true and correct. The document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is awarded.**

**Typed name of Authorized Official:**
- **Hon. Lee F. Jackson**

**Telephone Number:**
- **Dallas County Judge**
- 214/653-7555

**Signature of Authorized Official:**
- [Signature]
TO:       J. Allen Clemson  
          Dallas County Commissioners Court Administrator
FROM:    Sandra K. Peters  
          Computer Operations Supervisor, SCT Information Technology Services
THRU:    John Nero  
          Account Executive, SCT Information Technology Services
SUBJECT: Contract for data services between Verifacts Incorporated and Dallas County
DATE:    April 5, 2001

Background

A request has been received from Verifacts Incorporated to purchase the following: (1) a One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape; (2) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (3) a One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape; (4) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape.

Financial Impact/Considerations

Cost Recovery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Up Cost</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost for monthly Eviction Extract Tape</td>
<td>$648.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cost for monthly Criminal History Extract Tape</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First Year Cost</td>
<td>$2,438.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeding Annual Cost</td>
<td>$1,368.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Schedule

Implementation by SCT/Information Technology Services will commence within thirty days of the contract execution date.

Recommendation

SCT/Information Technology Services recommends this request.

Reviewed By: John Hennessey, Management Information Systems Director
ORDER NO. __________________

DATE _______________________

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF DALLAS

BE IT REMEMBERED, at a regular meeting of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County, Texas, held on the __________ day of ________________, 2001 on motion made by ________________________________, and seconded by ________________________________, the following order was adopted:

WHEREAS, This issue was briefed before Commissioners Court on April 17, 2001; and

WHEREAS, Verifacts Incorporated, has requested the following: (1) a One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape; (2) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (3) One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape; (4) a monthly Criminal History Extract tape; and

WHEREAS, The District Attorney’s Office has previously reviewed the data and rendered the opinion that it is public information under the Public Information Act; and

WHEREAS, The County Clerk has previously approved the data content; and

WHEREAS, Verifacts Incorporated, has paid $2,438.00 in advance for the following: (1) a One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape; (2) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (3) a One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape; (4) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape, and in the future will pay $1,368.00 annually for the following: (1) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (2) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape; and

WHEREAS, The services will begin within thirty days of the execution of the contract; and

WHEREAS, This request is recommended by the MIS Director.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorizes County Judge Lee F. Jackson to execute the contract between the County of Dallas and Verifacts Incorporated, on behalf of the County of Dallas. Verifacts Incorporated, has paid $2,438.00 in advance for the following: (1) a One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape; (2) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (3) a One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape; (4) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape; and in the future will pay $1,368.00 annually for the following: (1) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (2) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape.
DONE IN OPEN COURT this the ___________ day of __________________, 2001.

Lee F. Jackson                  Jim Jackson                  Mike Cantrell
Dallas County Judge            Commissioner, District No. 1   Commissioner, District No. 2

John Wiley Price
Commissioner, District No. 3

Recommended By: 
John Nero, Account Executive, SCT Information Technology Services

John M. Hennessey, Management Information Systems Director
CONTRACT FOR COMPUTER SERVICES

BETWEEN COUNTY OF DALLAS, TEXAS AND VERIFACTS INCORPORATED

Verifacts Incorporated, whose principal office address is 7226 27th St. W. Suite C, University Place, WA 98466 (hereinafter referred to as "Requestor"). and County of Dallas, Texas (hereinafter referred to as "County"). by and through the Dallas County Commissioners Court. and in consideration of the mutual covenants, agreements, and promises herein contained, do agree as follows:

I. SERVICES AND COST

County through its Information Technology Services Department will produce for the use of Requestor the following: (1) a One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape; (2) a monthly Eviction Extract Tape; (3) a one-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape and: (4) a monthly Criminal History Extract Tape.

Requestor agrees to reimburse County in the sum of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setup Fee</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Five Year Eviction History Tape</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost for monthly Eviction Extract Tape</td>
<td>$648.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Seven Year Criminal History Tape</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost for monthly Criminal History Extract Tape</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First Year Cost</td>
<td>$2438.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeding Annual Cost</td>
<td>$1368.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requestor will reimburse County all of its costs in advance on an annual basis, before any services shall be provided by County. Subject to any change in costs, all future payments for annual costs in succeeding years shall be in the amount of one thousand three hundred sixty eight dollars ($1368.00), due and payable thirty (30) days prior to the start of each year. Under the terms of this Contract, County will not provide to Requestor any complainant information or defendants' social security numbers.

Requestor understands and agrees that County may convert computer systems, or may address potential problems in existing systems (including, but not limited to, year 2000 compliance) as deemed necessary by County which may require County to reprogram its system in order to produce the above described judicial records. In that event, County shall provide Requestor thirty (30) days written notice of any cost of reprogramming or increase in annual costs. Requestor agrees to pay County such costs, unless it notifies County otherwise in writing within ten (10) days of receipt of notice from County. If Requestor sends County such written rejection of these additional costs, this Contract and all obligations hereunder shall immediately terminate.
II. TERM

The initial term of this Contract shall be one year from the date of execution. This Contract shall be automatically renewed annually thereafter unless either party gives written notice to the other thirty (30) days prior to the annual renewal date that it elects not to renew the Contract.

The Parties agree that upon the effective date of this Contract, any prior agreements or contracts between the parties shall be terminated. Further the parties agree that there are no outstanding obligation between the parties pursuant to any prior agreements or contracts.

III. TERMINATION

In addition to termination set forth in Section I and II, either of the parties shall have the right, in each party's sole discretion and at its sole option, to terminate this Contract by giving the other party thirty (30) days written notice of its intention to terminate.

IV. WARRANTY DISCLAIMER: LIMITATION OF LIABILITY: SOLE REMEDY

a. County does not warrant the accuracy of the information provided, and shall not be liable to Requestor or any other person for any damages arising, directly or indirectly, from any inaccurate information.

b. County shall not be liable for any defects in software or data, including "viruses" which may be inadvertently transmitted along with the requested information.

c. If either party breaches this Contract, the sole remedy shall be cancellation of the Contract. County shall provide all information due up to the date of cancellation. Requestor shall pay all fees owed up to the date of cancellation. County shall refund to Requestor all prepaid amounts on a pro rata basis for periods extending beyond the date of cancellation. Neither party shall be liable for any other damages, including costs, expenses or attorneys' fees, arising from the breach.

d. It is the express intention of the parties hereto that Requestor shall protect, defend, indemnify and hold County harmless from any and all claims, demands, judgments and expenses resulting from County's performance under this Contract. If County becomes a participant in legal proceedings due to the incidental or consequential use of information provided to Requestor, Requestor shall hold County harmless and indemnify County from all liability, including, but not limited to, all damages that may be awarded, attorneys' fees, court costs, and any and all other costs.

e. Requestor understands and agrees that County shall suffer no liability or expense of any kind as a result of this Contract, other than a refund of fees paid in accordance with subsection (c) of this section.
f. Requestor acknowledges and understands that often the information and records that have been purchased are required to be changed, including changes or deletions made pursuant to court-ordered expunctions of criminal records. Future copies of files already requested may be different and not agree with those previously delivered. Future monthly reports will not reference or notify Requestor of records that have been expunged pursuant to court order. Requestor shall take all steps necessary to insure that any requestor and any subsequent user of this information is properly informed of the likelihood of such changes and the existence in the database of records that have been expunged subsequent to the original receipt by Requestor of the information from County.

It is the express intention of the parties hereto that Requestor shall be solely responsible and liable for any damages, liability or any cause of action resulting from the expungement of previously acquired information from County and agrees to protect, defend, indemnify and hold County harmless from any and all claims, demands, judgments, costs (including attorneys’ fees) and expenses resulting from any sale, distribution or use of content or information furnished by County under this Contract to Requestor including but not limited to any expunged criminal histories, records or other information. All costs and expenses will be paid by Requestor as they accrue.

This Indemnification Provision shall survive the termination of this Contract.

V. AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATION

This Contract shall not be amended or modified except by written agreement executed by duly authorized representatives of Requestor and County.

VI. VENUE AND GOVERNING LAW

This Contract is expressly made subject to County’s Sovereign Immunity. Title 5, Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code. This Contract and all matters pertinent thereto shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas. and venue shall lie exclusively in Dallas County, Texas.

VII. FORMAL COURT APPROVAL

This Contract is expressly subject to and contingent upon formal approval by the Dallas County Commissioners Court.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF by their signatures hereon each of the undersigned represents and warrants that they are the duly authorized agents of each entity and have full right and authority to enter into this Contract. This Contract is to be effective upon the signature of both County and Requestor.

EXECUTED THIS ___ day of ________________ , 2001.

COUNTY OF DALLAS

BY: LEE F. JACKSON
COUNTY JUDGE

REQUESTOR

BY: Jim Piles
Verifacts Incorporated

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: John B. Dahill
Advisory Chief.
Civil Section
TO:  J. Allen Clemson
Dallas County Commissioners Court Administrator

FROM:  Sandra K. Peters
Computer Operations Supervisor, SCT Information Technology Services

THRU:  John Nero
Account Executive, SCT Information Technology Services

SUBJECT:  Contract for data services between Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney &
Counselor at Law and Dallas County

DATE:  April 5, 2001

Background

A request has been received from Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, to purchase the following: a daily report R06641: Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours.

Financial Impact/Considerations

Cost Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Up Cost</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Report R06641: Inmates Booked in During last 24 Hours</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First Quarter Cost</td>
<td>$1,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeding Quarterly Cost</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Schedule

Implementation by SCT/Information Technology Services will commence within thirty days of the contract execution date.

Recommendation

SCT/Information Technology Services recommends this request.

Reviewed By:  
John Hennessey, Management Information Systems Director
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COURT ORDER

ORDER NO. ________________
DATE ________________

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF DALLAS

BE IT RE MEMBERED, at a regular meeting of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County, Texas, held on the __________ day of ________________, 2001 on motion made by ____________________________ and seconded by __________________________________, the following order was adopted:

WHEREAS, This issue was briefed before Commissioners Court on April 17, 2001; and

WHEREAS, Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, has requested the following: a daily report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours; and

WHEREAS, The District Attorney’s Office has previously reviewed the data and rendered the opinion that it is public information under the Public Information Act; and

WHEREAS, The County Clerk has previously approved the data content; and

WHEREAS, Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, has paid $1,270.00 in advance for the following: a daily report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours, and in the future will pay $1,125.00 quarterly for the following: a daily report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours; and

WHEREAS, The services will begin within thirty days of the execution of the contract; and

WHEREAS, This request is recommended by the MIS Director.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorizes County Judge Lee F. Jackson to execute the contract between the County of Dallas and Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, on behalf of the County of Dallas. Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, has paid $1,270.00 in advance for the following: a daily report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours, and will in the future pay $1,125.00 quarterly for the following: a daily report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours.
DONE IN OPEN COURT this the __________ day of __________ 2001.

Lee F. Jackson
Dallas County Judge

Jim Jackson
Commissioner, District No. 1

Mike Cantrell
Commissioner, District No. 2

John Wiley Price
Commissioner, District No. 3

Kenneth A. Mayfield
Commissioner, District No. 4

Recommended By:  

John Nero, Account Executive, SCT Information Technology Services

John M. Hennessey, Management Information Systems Director
Clement O. Umeakuana, Attorney & Counselor at Law, whose principal office address is 2730 N. Stemmons Freeway, Suite 900, Dallas, Texas 75207 (hereinafter referred to as "Requestor", and County of Dallas, Texas (hereinafter referred to as "County"), by and through the Dallas County Commissioners Court, and in consideration of the mutual covenants, agreements, and promises herein contained, do agree as follows:

I. SERVICES AND COST

County through its Information Technology Services Department will produce for the use of Requestor a daily report R06641. Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours.

Requestor agrees to reimburse County in the sum of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Fee</th>
<th>$ 75.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set Up Cost</td>
<td>$ 70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Report R06641, Inmates Booked in During Last 24 Hours</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First Quarter</td>
<td>$1,270.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requestor will reimburse County all of its costs in advance on a quarterly basis before any services shall be provided by County. Subject to any change in costs, all future payments for quarterly costs in succeeding quarters shall be in the amount of one thousand one hundred twenty-five dollars ($1,125.00), due and payable thirty (30) days prior to the start of each quarter. Under the terms of this Contract, County will not provide to Requestor any complainant information or defendants’ social security numbers.

Requestor understands and agrees that County may convert computer systems, or may address potential problems in existing systems (including, but not limited to, year 2000 compliance) as deemed necessary by County which may require County to reprogram its system in order to produce the above described judicial records. In that event, County shall provide Requestor thirty (30) days written notice of any cost of reprogramming or increase in quarterly costs. Requestor agrees to pay County such costs, unless it notifies County otherwise in writing within ten (10) days of receipt of notice from County. If Requestor sends County such written rejection of these additional costs, this Contract and all obligations hereunder shall immediately terminate.
II. TERM

The initial term of this Contract shall be one year from the date of execution. This Contract shall be automatically renewed quarterly thereafter unless either party gives written notice to the other thirty (30) days prior to the quarterly renewal date that it elects not to renew the Contract.

III. TERMINATION

In addition to termination set forth in Section I and II. either of the parties shall have the right, in each party’s sole discretion and at its sole option, to terminate this Contract by giving the other party thirty (30) days written notice of its intention to terminate.

IV. WARRANTY DISCLAIMER: LIMITATION OF LIABILITY: SOLE REMEDY

a. County does not warrant the accuracy of the information provided, and shall not be liable to Requestor or any other person for any damages arising, directly or indirectly, from any inaccurate information.

b. County shall not be liable for any defects in software or data, including "viruses" which may be inadvertently transmitted along with the requested information.

c. If either party breaches this Contract, the sole remedy shall be cancellation of the Contract. County shall provide all information due up to the date of cancellation; Requestor shall pay all fees owed up to the date of cancellation. County shall refund to Requestor all prepaid amounts on a pro rata basis for periods extending beyond the date of cancellation. Neither party shall be liable for any other damages, including costs, expenses or attorneys’ fees, arising from the breach.

d. It is the express intention of the parties hereto that Requestor shall protect, defend, indemnify and hold County harmless from any and all claims, demands, judgments and expenses resulting from County’s performance under this Contract. If County becomes a participant in legal proceedings due to the incidental or consequential use of information provided to Requestor, Requestor shall hold County harmless and indemnify County from all liability, including, but not limited to, all damages that may be awarded, attorneys’ fees, court costs, and any and all other costs.

e. Requestor understands and agrees that County shall suffer no liability or expense of any kind as a result of this Contract, other than a refund of fees paid in accordance with subsection (c) of this section.
f. Requestor acknowledges and understands that often the information and records that have been purchased are required to be changed, including changes or deletions made pursuant to court-ordered expunctions of criminal records. Future copies of files already requested may be different and not agree with those previously delivered. Future monthly reports will not reference or notify Requestor of records that have been expunged pursuant to court order. Requestor shall take all steps necessary to insure that any requestor and any subsequent user of this information is properly informed of the likelihood of such changes and the existence in the database of records that have been expunged subsequent to the original receipt by Requestor of the information from County.

It is the express intention of the parties hereto that Requestor shall be solely responsible and liable for any damages, liability or any cause of action resulting from the expungement of previously acquired information from County and agrees to protect, defend, indemnify and hold County harmless from any and all claims, demands, judgments, costs (including attorneys' fees) and expenses resulting from any sale, distribution or use of content or information furnished by County under this Contract to Requestor including but not limited to any expunged criminal histories, records or other information. All costs and expenses will be paid by Requestor as they accrue.

This Indemnification Provision shall survive the termination of this Contract.

V. AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATION

This Contract shall not be amended or modified except by written agreement executed by duly authorized representatives of Requestor and County.

VI. VENUE AND GOVERNING LAW

This Contract is expressly made subject to County’s Sovereign Immunity, Title 5, Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code. This Contract and all matters pertinent thereto shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas, and venue shall lie exclusively in Dallas County, Texas.

VII. FORMAL COURT APPROVAL

This Contract is expressly subject to and contingent upon formal approval by the Dallas County Commissioners Court.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF by their signatures hereon each of the undersigned represents and warrants that they are the duly authorized agents of each entity and have full right and authority to enter into this Contract. This Contract is to be effective upon the signature of both County and Requestor.

EXECUTED THIS ___ day of ______________, 2001.

COUNTY OF DALLAS

BY: LEE F. JACKSON
COUNTY JUDGE

REQUESTOR

BY: Clement O. Umeakuana
Attorney and Counselor at Law

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: John B. Dahill
Advisory Chief
Civil Section
Date: April 5, 2001
To: Commissioners Court
From: John Hennessey, MIS Director
Subject: Convenience Fees for Website

Background

The launch for the Dallas County Online portal is slated for Monday, April 23, 2001. In addition to the redesigned website, the launch will focus on the County’s Tax Department and the presentation of two interactive payment applications: renewal of vehicle registration, and property taxes.

To facilitate the ability to provide payment to the County, the Dallas County Online portal will offer various methods of payment to include:

- Credit Cards
  - VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express (in negotiation)

- Debit Cards
  - VISA, MasterCard

- Electronic Check

Texas Local Interactive has contracted with each of these companies to provide this service through the Dallas County Online portal. The costs for these services are estimated to average 2.4% of the cost of services. As the County has chosen not to absorb these costs, they will be included in the convenience fees charged to the users of these services.

It is expected that the majority of customers to the Dallas County Online website will use a credit card. Based on Texas Local research, Dallas County residents are not familiar, and therefore, not comfortable with using electronic check as a preferred method of payment at this time.
Research as the Basis of Fees

Texas Local has conducted comprehensive research before the development of the applications for both the payment of property taxes and vehicle registration renewal. A cross section of individuals and businesses throughout Dallas County has been interviewed, competitors' offerings have been analyzed, and other sites throughout the United States were reviewed. Additionally, Texas Local analyzed the costs of offering these services to the citizens and businesses in the county.

Based on that research Texas Local determined that citizens and businesses are willing to pay for the convenience of doing business through the Dallas County Online portal. In terms of property tax payment, research indicates Dallas County residents are willing to pay up to 5% of the overall property tax payment. Harris County offers this service to its citizens at a cost of 2.4%, and a national provider of payment services charges 2.6% for the same services. All fees are passed on the user. Texas Local has developed a sliding scale of costs associated with the level of tax payment that averages 3% to cover the costs of using a credit card and provide for a convenience fee. The portal also offers the option of electronic check payments at a cost that is significantly less than that of using a credit card.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Transaction</th>
<th>Fee per Transaction Credit Card</th>
<th>Fee per Transaction Electronic Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER - $ 250.00</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
<td>$2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 250.01 - $ 500.00</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 500.01 - $ 750.00</td>
<td>$26.25</td>
<td>$4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 750.01 - $ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,001.01 - $ 1,500.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,500.01 - $ 2,000.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,000.01 - $ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,000.01 - $ 4,000.00</td>
<td>$128.00</td>
<td>$14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 4,000.01 - $ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,000.01 - $ 7,500.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 7,500.01 - $ 10,000.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 10,000.01 - $ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td>$66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 20,000.01 - $ 30,000.00</td>
<td>$960.00</td>
<td>$98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,000.01 - $ 40,000.00</td>
<td>$1,280.00</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 40,000.01 - $ 50,000.00</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td>$162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 50,000.01 - $ 75,000.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$242.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 75,000.01 - $ 99,999.99</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
<td>$322.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For vehicle registration renewal, Texas Local research has shown that a $4.00 convenience fee is in line with what citizens are willing to pay for this service. Both California and Utah charge a $4.00 convenience fee for vehicle registration renewals and both portals have been successful in driving up the adoption rates for this service. There is no fee differential for electronic checks on this transaction.

Building visibility with citizens and businesses is an essential part in gaining adoption. It is a process that takes time and effort. Through 2001, it is estimated that the portal will service the payment of approximately 2% renewals of the 1.7 million registered vehicles in the County, growing to 7% in the year 2002.

With the next property tax season, which begins in the Fall of 2001, it is estimated that the portal will service approximately 5% of the 350,000 residents who pay for their property taxes directly, increasing to 10% in the 2002 property tax season.

**Servicing the Business Community**

Texas Local has surveyed a cross section of the companies that have vehicle fleets and determined that they would be most interested in the ability to renew their fleet registrations online. These companies are interested in a subscription service that would allow them to renew multiple vehicles at the same time. Fleet managers overwhelming noted that an online service would save time and be more efficient. Currently, the County only allows 25 vehicles to be registered at one time. The average fleet manager needs to register 175 vehicles per month. Fleet managers would be happy to pay a monthly subscription/convenience fee of up to $100 per month with a small per transaction fee per vehicle for the ease and convenience of handling this online.

**Summary**

As a self-funding portal, Texas Local takes on all the risk—and the cost of developing the portal site and payment applications, as well as purchasing and maintaining all the hardware and software needed to host the portal, allowing the County to use its funds for other services needed by the citizens and businesses it serves.

The convenience fees established by Texas Local for the services offered by the Dallas County Online portal includes all costs for offering a large variety of payment options. In addition to the costs of using either credit or debit
cards, the site offers the ability to use electronic checks for which the cost is only 10% of the cost of using other methods. In addition, the traditional methods always offered by the county—mail or visiting payment desks at County locations are always available.

Texas Local is committed to the Dallas County Online portal for the long term and is willing to take all the risk and costs associated with this in order to position Dallas County as the Flagship portal for Texas. The goal is to increase adoption rates to the web site as quickly as possible, which, in turn, will enable Texas Local to build additional applications to serve Dallas County citizens and businesses.

**Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact to the county at this time since all costs are funded through the portal convenience fees by the users of those services.

**Recommendation**

The contract with Texas Local allows the Commissioners Court to set all convenience fees charged through the portal. Texas Local will abide by that decision.

The Court has two options: set the fees or allow the suggested Texas Local fees to be implemented and not take any action at this time.

It is recommended that the Court take no action at this time and allow the Texas Local suggested fees to be implemented. The portal fee process is designed to be self-regulating with the market forces driving the fees to the appropriate level. The portal usage will be monitored and reports provided to the Court on a monthly basis beginning in June 2001. Customer satisfaction surveys will be conducted and email to the webmaster will be monitored to determine any issues with the portal or the convenience fees. This information will be included in the monthly report.
MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Allen Clemson
Commissioners Court

FROM: Space Utilization Committee
Ed Bailey, Facility Planner
Facilities Management

SUBJECT: Dallas County Employees Credit Union
Lease Renewal

Background of Issue

The Dallas County Employees Credit Union (DCECU) currently leases space from Dallas County in three (3) locations under agreements per Court Orders No. 97-566, dated March 25, 1997 and 97-727 dated April 15, 1997. The location of these offices are the Health and Human Services Complex (3,543 sq ft), Old Criminal Courts Building (626 sq ft), and the Frank Crowley Courts Building (470 sq ft). The leases are due to expire on April 22, 2001. As you recall, the Credit Union per Court Order No. 2001-248 dated January 30, 2001 was granted approval for a reallocation of space at the downtown location. This reallocation entails closing the Old Criminal Courts Building office and replacing the services with a remote banking kiosk in the George Allen Courts Building. The Credit Union has informed staff that the technology to perform the services they intended to deliver at the new location is not available at this time. Therefore, it is their desire to renew the current leases at all three locations for five (5) years.

The purpose of this correspondence is to present to the Commissioners Court the Space Utilization Committee's recommendation regarding this request.
Impact on Operations/Financial

As indicated, the Dallas County Employees Credit Union occupies space (to include lease rates) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Lease Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>$4.33 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex 8th Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>($1,278 43 mo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2377 Stemmons</td>
<td></td>
<td>($15,341 19 yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Criminal Courts Building</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>$4.15 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>($216 49 mo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 Main</td>
<td></td>
<td>($2,597 90 yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Crowley Courts Building</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 N Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current lease rates for space at the Health and Human Service Complex and the Old Criminal Courts Building covers reimbursement to Dallas County for utilities, security and janitorial services. The DCECU is responsible for maintenance of the premises with the exception of the heating and air conditioning systems.

In lieu of rent at the Frank Crowley Courts Building, the Commissioners Court, per Court Order No. 92-891, dated June 9, 1992, agreed to allow the DCECU use of space at this location at no cost in exchange for services provided to County employees. These services include sale of bus tickets, banking services, purchase of discount tickets, loan requests, etc. Under the agreement Dallas County is responsible for utilities, security and janitorial services.

Facilities Management has reviewed the current reimbursable rates and recommends a new rate of $4.50 per square foot. Below is a comparison of the old versus the proposed new rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>$4.33/sf</td>
<td>$4.50/sf</td>
<td>$0.17/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,278 43/mo</td>
<td>$1,328 63/mo</td>
<td>$50.02/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,341 19/yr</td>
<td>$15,943 50/yr</td>
<td>$602.31/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Criminal Courts</td>
<td>$4.15/sf</td>
<td>$4.50/sf</td>
<td>$0.35/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$216 49/mo</td>
<td>$234 75/mo</td>
<td>$18.26/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,597 90/yr</td>
<td>$2,817.00/yr</td>
<td>$219.10/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Crowley Courts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The DCECU will continue the same in-kind services at each location that is presently provided. The lease renewals will be continued under the same terms and conditions to include a CPI adjustment after the first year anniversary of the new lease. Further, the Lessee and Lessor shall have the right to terminate the lease by giving written notice sixty (60) days in advance to the other party.

**Recommendation**

The Space Utilization Committee recommends the following:

1) approval for the renewal of leases for space at the Health and Human Services and the Old Criminal Courts Buildings for five years at the rate of $4.50 per square foot and.

2) approval for the renewal of the lease at the Frank Crowley Courts Building for five years at no charge as briefed.

If Commissioners Court concurs, a Court Order will be placed on the next agenda.

Approved by

Dan Savage
Administrative Assistant for Operations

cc Jennifer Naughton, President/CEO, Dallas County Employees Credit Union
John DaHill, Assistant District Attorney, Civil Section

EB eb credit union lease renewal 3/20/01
MEMORANDUM

TO Commissioners Court

FROM Space Utilization Committee
   Ed Bailey, Facilities Space Planner
   Facilities Management

SUBJECT Community Supervision and Corrections Satellite Office
   3650 North Buckner, Dallas Texas
   Renewal Lease

Background

Dallas County entered into a five year Lease Agreement for 8,235 square feet of office space by Court Order No. 95-2048 dated November 21, 1995 for the Community Supervision and Corrections Department. Their lease will expire April 30, 2001. The Community Supervision and Corrections Department reveals that the existing location is suitable, however the department is requesting consideration for additional space at this location in order to expand in-house programs for their clients and staff. Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD) is requesting that Dallas County renew the lease at this location for another five year period. Staff has been working with the Community Supervision and Corrections Department and the Landlord in developing options for this location.

The purpose of this correspondence is to present to the Commissioners Court the Space Utilization Committee recommendation regarding this issue.

Impact on Operations/Financial

As indicated CSCD states the current location is suitable, but desires additional office space in order to expand in-house service programs such as GED preparation and substance abuse classes, counseling services, etc. The Landlord has offered to lease to Dallas County, another office suite (10,000 square feet) which is currently occupied by another tenant. The tenant is in the process of relocating. In order to provide office space for CSCD, the Landlord has offered proposals that includes 1) renewal of the existing 8,235 square feet of space for a monthly base rental of $7,548.75 or $11.00 per square foot, and 2) rental of 10,000 square feet of soon to be vacated office space at the same location for a monthly base rental of $8,667 or $10.40 per square foot. Each offer will be under the same terms and conditions as the current Lease Agreement with the exception of the base rent. Dallas County will be responsible for its own utilities, janitorial and maintenance which currently

600 Commerce, 9th Floor
George L. Allen Sr., Courts Building
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 653-7175
Fax (214) 653-6822
averages $2,580 30 per month or $3 75 per square foot. The total monthly cost of the current lease is $7,727 or $11 25 per square foot.

The following is a comparison of the current rent versus the Landlord's proposals for office space at the North Buckner location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Lease</th>
<th>Option I</th>
<th>Option II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Square Feet</strong></td>
<td>8.235 s.f.</td>
<td>8.235 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Rent</strong></td>
<td>$5.146 87</td>
<td>$7.548 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($7 50/s f.)</td>
<td>($11 00/s f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>$1.152 90</td>
<td>$1.152 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($1 68 s f.)</td>
<td>($1 68 s f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County pays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janitorial</strong></td>
<td>$741 15</td>
<td>$741 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($1 08/s f.)</td>
<td>($1 08/s f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>$686 25</td>
<td>$686 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($1 00/s f.)</td>
<td>($1 00/s f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County pays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenant Finish Out</strong></td>
<td>Included in Base Rent</td>
<td>Included in Base Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($25 020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Area</strong></td>
<td>Included in Base Rent</td>
<td>Included in Base Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Payment</strong></td>
<td>$7,727.17</td>
<td>$10,129.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($11.25/s.f.)</td>
<td>($14.25/s.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Increase for new lease</strong></td>
<td>$2,401.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the Space Utilization Committee recommend to Commissioners Court the additional space...
for CSCD, the Landlord has agreed to extend the current lease for six months at the current base rental rate of $750 to allow for modifications and further planning with CSCD which will include computer, telephone and move costs. The CSCD has been at this location for over ten years, the execution of a five year renewal at this location for the current or optional new space will preclude the necessity of relocating to some other area of the County. As you are aware it is difficult to locate space that will meet Dallas County’s Community Assessment needs.

Recommendation

The Space Utilization Committee recommends that the Community Supervision and Corrections current lease be extended for a six month period (under the same terms, conditions and rates) until such time as a renewal lease is finalized with the Landlord and the benefits to expand into additional office space can be validated by CSCD and staff.

Approved by

[Signature]
Dan Savage
Assistant Administrator for Operations

attachments

EB eb JB

cscd buckner lease ren 2001

xc Ron Goethals, Director, CSCD
Reggie Storey, Manager, CSCD
DALLAS COUNTY
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

LOCATION: Buckner Square Office Park
SIZE: 10,000 square feet
MONTHLY RENTAL: 10-YEAR TERM
Years 1 through 5: $8,250.00
   * 209.00
     $8,459.00
Years 6 through 10: $9,916.00
   * 209.00
     $10,125.00

5-YEAR TERM
Years 1 through 5: $8,250.00
   * 417.00
     $8,667.00

Tenant pays: Electric, gas, janitorial
Landlord pays: Taxes, insurance, common area maintenance

Landlord will perform the following:

  Paint all walls the color white
  New carpet throughout
  Add breakroom
  Create corridor to elevator
  Add improvements requested by Tenant

  Tenant may place sign on building
  Tenant may utilize side of building for employee parking

* Amortized cost of requested additions by tenant.

PETER KOSLEY
HENRY S. MILLER COMMERCIAL
972-419-4033
Proposal for Buckner Square showing a 5 year term and a 10 year term.

On a 5 year term, a renewal term and rate would have to be renegotiated.

With a new ten year term the county would know what the rate is for the next ten years.

Landlord can go either way. Call me with any questions you may have.
ATTENTION: Tim D. Kirk

I received the revised drawing for our East Satellite Office on Thursday. I was out of the office on Friday and, thus, I was unable to return your call. In reviewing the drawing, all my recommended changes appear to be added, however, I have one question remaining in the clerical area, room 09.

Currently room 09 consists of three existing offices. We proposed to remove walls to make 09 a large clerical area. On the original set of proposed plans submitted, the room contained three windows with each clerk having an individual work station built under each of them. We did not need all the windows and work station and asked that one large window be installed and that two of the proposed work stations be removed. On the recommended changes I resubmitted, I rudely indicated we needed a built-in counter top/work station under the single, larger pay window. The counter top was to extend from the corner of the remaining wall of the office to where we removed the wall between the first and second offices. It appears the architect replaced the three windows with a single window, but removed all of the work stations.

From the revised drawing, it now appears the area is designed for a secretarial desk to be placed under the window in room 09. My concern over this concept is that the clerk will be accepting payments through the window practically all day. Our current offices have countertops built in under the pay window that are approximately 18 inches wide and are open underneath. The clerks may roll their chairs close to the window opening and are capable of reaching the window without difficulty. I would like to have something like that included.

The workstation does not need to extend beyond the window along the interior of room 09, but should go the corner toward the secured door. The remainder of the counter top, which is not under the window, should be at least 24 inches wide. Dallas County normally builds in a two drawer filing cabinet to support the counter top. The window size could be reduced from eight to five feet to accommodate this request.

Please call me at 214/653-5204 and I will try to explain these changes, if necessary. I will fax you a copy of my proposed changes.

CC: Ed Bailey
From: Reggie Storey
To: Saundra Johnson
Subject: East Office Space

Additionally, with the added space, the department could offer training classes for staff at the ESO, as well. Our regulatory agency, CJAD, requires that our officer obtain 80 hours of training each biennial. The conference/break room could be used as a training site. Last year we spent $6750.00 in classroom rental fees; the year before, we spent approximately $1600.00. So the cost of rental fees are escalating. With the funds saved, we can offer more training and services for staff.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 13, 2000
To: Saundra Johnson
From: Reggie Storey

Subject: Space Needed at our East Satellite Office

Attached is another memo from our East Satellite Office (ESO) supervisor, Charlie Vann. His memo outlines both the current classes being conducted there, as well as his proposed group meetings. As you can tell, the current space limits the number of participants and the number of classes we can offer. Plus there is no way to conduct a staff meeting with the approximately 50 staff members assigned to the ESO.

The available space in the old DHS offices will allow us to expand our counseling services tremendously. Classes could be conducted during the day. We presently use our waiting area after 5:00 p.m. as a class room. We could better utilize our counseling staff by simultaneously conducting classes in different rooms. We wish to offer 12 more weekly group sessions of varying services for our clients. The most significant offering we plan to implement is Thinking For A Change (TFC). We could provide five TFC group sessions if space becomes available.

Currently, we provide services for approximately 330 clients per week or 66 clients per day at the ESO. A waiting list for referrals to classes does exist. With the proposed classes, we can increase the number of clients participating in new classes significantly. Not only would we gain at least 220 clients through new classes, existing classes could expand to accommodate at least 44 more clients per week in our CATS programs and employment sessions. That equates to being able to serve approximately 600 ESO clients per week or 120 per day. If Garland brought their clients there, as well, we could expand each counseling session run by CATS to between 32 and 40 participants daily or between 120 and 184 more clients per week.

With the proposed sessions and current space limitations at the ESO, we seek three different conference/training areas. Using the County space standards, we need two 660 square foot areas to conduct training for clients (20 participants, 2 counselors times 30 sq. ft/ person). This need could increase if Garland moves their CATS program.
to the ESO. Additionally, the ESO basically has no conference room or break room for staff. We request at least 1000 sq. ft. for those purposes (50 staff member times 20 sq. ft.). Therefore we seek approximately 2320 square feet for our ESO operation.

The CSCD recognizes that we may not need all the space available at the old DHS offices. We do want the County to recognize that any additional conference/training room space would only enhance staff morale and our effort to change the behavior and habits of the clients we service. We can not do these things without the opportunities this space affords us.
ESO REQUEST FOR CONFERENCE ROOM SPACE

The following schedule of the ESO groups lists the current groups and planned groups. The number of participants in each group session is indicated in parenthesis.

*************** CURRENT GROUPS ***************

MONDAY:  1230PM TO 100PM MAX (6)
         400PM TO 600PM CATS SOP ORIENTATION (16)
         600PM TO 800PM CATS SOP (16)
         600PM TO 800PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)

TUESDAY: 800AM TO 1000AM CATS SOP (16)
          1230PM TO 100PM MAX (6)
          600PM TO 800PM CATS AFTERCARE (16)
          600PM TO 800PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)

WEDNESDAY: 1230PM TO 100PM MAX (6)
            600PM TO 800PM CATS SOP (16)
            600PM TO 630PM MAX (20)
            645PM TO 715PM MAX (20)
            800PM TO 830PM MAX (20)
            830PM TO 900PM SANCTIONS (20)

THURSDAY: 800AM TO 1000AM CATS SOP (16)
           1230PM TO 100PM MAX (6)
           600PM TO 630PM MAX (20)
           645PM TO 715PM MAX (20)
           730PM TO 800PM SANCTIONS (20)
           800PM TO 830PM MAX (20)

FRIDAY:  1000AM TO 1200PM EMPLOYMENT (10)
         1230PM TO 100PM MAX (6)
         100PM TO 300PM EMPLOYMENT (10)

*************** PLANNED GROUPS ***************

MONDAY:  800AM TO 1000AM TFC (20)
          800AM TO 1000AM CATS (20)
          1000AM TO 1200PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)
          600PM TO 800PM TFC (20)

TUESDAY: 1000AM TO 1200PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)
          400PM TO 600PM TFC (20)

WEDNESDAY: 800AM TO 1000AM CATS (20)
            800AM TO 1000AM TFC (20)
            1000AM TO 1200PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)
            600PM TO 800PM TFC (20)

THURSDAY: 1000AM TO 1200PM FINANCIAL MGMT. (20)
           400PM TO 600PM TFC (20)
The ESO Learning Lab (GED/Literacy) is in operation Monday through Thursday from 700am to 1200pm and from 400pm to 800pm. The Learning Lab has 8 participants. The Learning Lab is conducted in what was formerly the staff conference room. From 1200pm to 400pm Monday through Thursday the Learning Lab is used for staff conferences and training. The presence of the 8 computer monitors (GED/LITERACY) makes the room too small to conduct the various ESO groups, other than the Employment group.

>>> The current groups will remain in operation.
The planned groups will be added to the current schedule.

>>> Until recently our CATS counselor has officed in the same room in which the CATS groups are conducted. The CATS room was reserved on Monday and Wednesday mornings for CATS individual counseling sessions. This is why no current groups have been scheduled on those mornings.

>>> The CATS groups would like to expand from 16 participants to 20 participants at each session.

>>> The 1230PM MAX groups would like to expand from 6 participants to 12 participants with at least a possible 20 participants.

>>> The after hours MAX groups and SANCTIONS groups will not be expanded. They have been averaging 20 participants per session.
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Gloria McCulloch-Webb, Purchasing Analyst
SUBJECT: Request for Proposals for Third Party Claims Administration Services for Dallas County Self Insurance Workers Compensation Program, RFP No. 2001-108-850

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

Dallas County Commissioners Court authorized the Purchasing Department to open RFP No. 2001-108-850, Request for Proposals for Third Party Claims Administration Services for Dallas County Self-Insurance Workers Compensation Program on April 2, 2001. Proposals were opened as authorized by the Court. The Purchasing Department received a total of nine (9) proposals prior to deadline of 2:00 p.m. on April 2, 2001. The firms who responded were: Cunningham Lindsey, CCS Consulting, Hammerman and Gainer, Inc., Cambridge Integrated Services Group, Inc., Southern Risk Service, Inc., Frank Gates Services Company, Holmes Murphy, Ward North America, and Crawford and Company.

The evaluation committee was formed consisting of the Personnel Department (Jim Gresham Kathleen Shields), Auditor’s Office (Diana Grafton), Juvenile (Cody Jones) and Sheriff’s Department (Al Herrera). The evaluation committee met on April 05, 2001, to discuss the responses to the RFP and perform the initial point scoring of the proposals using the criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals.

Based on the initial evaluation, point scoring, discussion by the committee members and in accordance with the appropriate guidelines stated in the RFP, it was determined that four (4) of the offerors (Cunningham Lindsey, CCS Consulting, Hammerman and Gainer, Inc. and Cambridge Integrated Services Group, Inc.) were reasonably susceptible of being selected for award and should be invited to participate in the second phase of the Request for Proposal process, which includes the oral presentation and interviews. Oral presentation and interviews were conducted on April 9, 2001 in the Dallas County Purchasing Department. Oral presentation and interviews allowed the committee members to ask questions regarding their proposal and identify Dallas County expectations and concerns. At the end of the interview process each committee member had the opportunity to re-calculate his or her point allocation as deemed necessary. Attached for the Commissioners Court review is a breakdown of each committee members point allocation assigned to each offeror. The report details the evaluation criteria and the maximum point value allowance for each category. The committee allocated a total of eighty-five (85) points and the Director of Minority Affairs allocated the remaining fifteen (15) points. Overall, Cunningham Lindsey scored the highest average point value totaling 74.5. CCS Consulting – 73.25 points, Hammerman and Gainer, Inc. – 68.5 points, Cambridge Integrated Services Group, Inc. – 65.5 points, Holmes Murphy – 58.25 points, Ward North America – 57.25 points, Crawford and Company – 51.0 points, Frank Gates Services Company – 48.5 points and Southern Risk Service, Inc. – 43.25 points.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

It is estimated that the financial impact for the services requested in the proposal will be approximately $178,000.00 per year based on quoted rates and past year claim history not including Allocated Expenses.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee that the Commissioners Court award RFP No. 2001-108-850 to the highest rated firm (Cunningham Lindsey) with an average score totaling 74.5 points.

Should the Court concur with this recommendation of the evaluation committee, a Court Order will be scheduled for the next regular agenda for approval of the evaluation committee selection and award.

Approved By:

John J. Cantwell, Director of Purchasing

cc: Matsey Maudlin-Taylor, Director Personnel Civil Service
    Kathleen Shields, Assistant Director Personnel Civil Service
    Jim Gresham, Risk Manager Personnel Civil Service
    Diana Grafton, County Auditor's Office
    Al Herrera, Sheriff's Department
    Cody Jones, Juvenile Department
Revised Points After
Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001: 108: 850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firm: Cunningham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WE: Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>74.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Points After Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm: CCG Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>73250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Points After Interview on 4/19/01

**RFP NO. 2001: 108: 850**

**Evaluator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm: Hammerman &amp; Gainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                           | 66     | 67      | 81    | 60      | 274   | 68.500  |
**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Gresham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm: Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RFP NO. 2001:108:850**

**Evaluator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firm: Holmes Murphy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>58.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Points After Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

**Evaluator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firm: Ward North America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>57.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Points After
Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Gresham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Firm: Crawford**

| Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points) | 15 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 68 | 17,000 |
| Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points) | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 30 | 7,500 |
| Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points) | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 32 | 8,000 |
| Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points) | 13 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 48 | 12,000 |
| Cost of Services (0-30 points) | 6 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 26 | 6,500 |
| M/WBE Participation (0-15 points) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,000 |
| **Total** | **50** | **46** | **54** | **54** | **204** | **51,000** |
Revised Points After
Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm: Southern Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Points After Interview on 4/9/01

**RFP NO. 2001-108-850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Gresham</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Herrera</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firm:</strong> Frank Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capabilities, Proven Skills, and Technical Competence (0-20 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Completeness of Proposal (0-10 points)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and References with other government agencies or companies providing this type of service (0-10 points)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan, Claim Service Standard, Philosophy and Credential of Management Staff (0-15 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services (0-30 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation (0-15 points)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioners Court

FROM: Selas Camarillo, P.E., R.P.L.
Assistant Director - Property Division

SUBJECT: Resale of Tax Foreclosed Properties via a Sealed Bid Procedure
Request for Bid No. 2001-093-821, Sale 13

BACKGROUND

On February 27, 2001, the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorized the Purchasing Department to solicit bids for the resale of three tax foreclosed properties. Sealed bids to sell the tax foreclosure properties advertised in Request for Bid No. 2001-093-821 were received by the Purchasing Department on April 5, 2001. The results of the bid are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Bidder's Name</th>
<th>Judgment Amount*</th>
<th>Minimum Bid Amount</th>
<th>Bid Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCAD Account #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515 Metrocrest, Carrollton, Texas</td>
<td>1. Michael K. Sartain</td>
<td>$174,580.43</td>
<td>$20,000.00(5)</td>
<td>$53,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #90-31040-TI</td>
<td>2. Bea's Kids</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>$41,931.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAD #1405950011001000</td>
<td>3. Neil Felder</td>
<td>$31,580.00</td>
<td>$31,090.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Sea Hawk Drive, DeSoto, Texas</td>
<td>4. Jonathan Kutner, Tr.</td>
<td>$31,580.00</td>
<td>$31,090.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #95-30490-TE</td>
<td>5. William Janecek</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAD #200314500008B0000</td>
<td>6. Al Sani</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Sea Hawk Drive, DeSoto, Texas</td>
<td>1. Quanset Corporation</td>
<td>$53,041.01</td>
<td>$25,000.00(3)</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #95-30490-TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00(3)</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAD #2003145000110000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000.00(3)</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Denotes number of times property has been offered for resale

*Judgment Amount: The minimum bid announced by the Sheriff’s Department at the Sheriff’s Sale includes the total amount of taxes, penalties and interest awarded in the judgment plus court costs, attorney’s fees, post judgment interest, sheriff’s fees and publishing fees.

411 Elm Street, 4th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 653-7151
LEGAL INFORMATION

This sale is in compliance with the Property Tax Code, Section 34.05 and the Revised Tax Foreclosure Resale Policy adopted by the Commissioners Court via Court Order No. 2000-396. The Cities of DeSoto and Carrollton and the Dallas and Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School District have been requested to consent to the sale of these properties. All sales are subject to and conditioned upon approval of the Dallas County Commissioners Court and each taxing unit entitled to receive proceeds of the sale under the judgment.

The Quanset Corporation submitted the only bid on 150 and 160 Seahawk in DeSoto for $12,500.00 for each property, which was $12,500.00 below the advertised minimum bid amount of $25,000.00 per property, creating non-conforming bids.

Dallas County will execute a Quitclaim Deed which will contain an acknowledgment that the property is subject to the prior owners' right of redemption, if any, and that the property is being purchased "AS IS, WHERE IS" and "WITH ALL FAULTS" and the County of Dallas has no responsibility for the condition of the property.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Of the three properties offered for sealed bids, one received bids above the advertised minimum bid amount. The high bid received on 1515 Metrocrest of $53,010.00 is approximately $121,570.00 less that the total amount of the judgments against the property. The cost to advertise the notice in the Dallas Morning News was $1,774.08 or $591.36 for each tract ($1,774.08/3). Accordingly, Dallas County may deduct its pro rata share of the advertising costs for the tract that sold. Fund 0120, Department 9930, Expense Code 2013 will be reimbursed $591.36.

In accordance with the Tax Code, Sec. 34.06. Distribution of Proceeds of Resale, the purchasing taxing unit shall pay all costs and expenses of court, sale, and resale and, after deducting an amount equal to the amount the taxing unit has reasonably spent for the maintenance and preservation of the property, shall distribute the remainder of the proceeds to each taxing unit participating in the sale in an amount equal to the proportion each participant's taxes, penalties, and interest bear to the total amount of taxes, penalties, and interest due all participants in the sale, less any amount previously paid as costs on the property.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Order to Accept Bid &amp; Authorizing Execution of Quitclaim Deed</td>
<td>April 24, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Purchase Price Due</td>
<td>May 24, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute Quitclaim Deed</td>
<td>May 24, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Public Works has reviewed the bids submitted and recommends that the Commissioners Court: (1) reject the non-conforming bids submitted by the Quanset Corporation on 150 and 160 Seahawk in DeSoto of $12,500.00 each property, as the bids were $12,500.00 less than the advertised minimum bid amount of $25,000.00, (2) award the bid to the following highest bidder in the amount of his respective bid as shown
below. subject to and conditioned upon approval of each taxing unit entitled to receive proceeds of the sale under the judgment and the previous owners’ right of redemption, if any. (3) authorize the sale of this property by quitclaim deed. and (4) authorize the Tax Assessor Collector to receive the awarded bid amount below and disburse the proceeds in accordance with the Property Tax Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder:</th>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>Bid Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael K. Sartain</td>
<td>1515 Metrocrest. Carrollton. TX</td>
<td>$53,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4513 Old Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano. TX 75024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Commissioners Court is in agreement. a court order authorizing the matters above will be placed on the next regular agenda.

APPROVED BY:

Donald R. Holzwarth. P.E.
Director of Public Works

xc: John Dahill, Advisory Chief, Assistant District Attorney's Office, Civil Section
    John Cantwell, Purchasing Department
    David Childs, Tax Assessor/Collector
    DeMetris Sampson, Attorney, LHGBGPS
April 11, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

From: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator
For Operations

Subject: Change Order to architectural services contract for Old Red Courthouse Preservation Project with James Pratt Architecture Urban Design Inc.

Background
By Court Order 2001-194, dated January 23, 2001, the Commissioners Court approved a contract with James Pratt Architecture Urban Design Inc. for Phase I work on the Old Red Courthouse Preservation Project. This contract calls for the preparation of plans and specifications and contract administration for five specific tasks including hazardous material abatement. When the contract was originally drafted the hazardous materials abatement was limited to lead based paint abatement. James Pratt’s team included the abatement consultant T.K. Matt and Associates. T.K. Matt is under contract with Dallas County to do consulting work for asbestos abatement. Because of this contract with the County, the original plan called for the County staff to engage T.K. Matt to do the asbestos abatement under the County contract and then have T.K. Matt do the lead base paint consulting as a subcontractor to James Pratt at a later time. Because we have expedited the schedule for the selective demolition work, it is now feasible to combine all of the abatement work into one project. This should enable us to get better bids from the abatement contractors and should reduce the overall project management requirements for the abatement work. Attached is a change order proposal from James Pratt, plus detailed proposals from T.K. Matt for the combined lead base paint and asbestos consulting.

Impact on Operations
This change order will simplify the construction administration for the hazardous materials abatement and it should result in the contractor completing all of the abatement work more expeditiously than the work would be completed under two separate contracts. It will also eliminate a general contractor’s markup by not including it in the other construction work to be done at a later date. Having one contractor working should make it easier to minimize the disruption to the existing operations in the Old Red Courthouse.
Financial
The change order will increase the contract with James Pratt by $26,270, but this will be offset by a reduction in anticipated asbestos abatement costs that the County would have incurred if it had administered the contract with T.K. Matt. Funding for the overall preservation work is included in the FY 2001 Capital Improvement Plan budget in account 196.2001 in the amount of $5,237,500. This includes money for the hazardous materials abatement.

MWBE
T.K. Matt is a minority contractor. He was scheduled to do this consulting work under either approach.

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Commissioners Court approve the proposed change order with James Pratt in the amount of $26,270 with an allowance of $17.00 each for additional samples if needed, with the understanding that the asbestos abatement and lead base paint abatement work will be done together as one abatement project. If the Court agrees with this briefing, a Court Order will be prepared for consideration at the next meeting.

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

cc: Allen Clemson
Bernie Blanton
Jim Barrett
In accordance with the written Agreement dated as of January 25, 2001 between the parties designated below for THE PROJECT:

Phase I-Old Red Preservation Project, Order No. 2001-194

The Dallas County hereby authorizes the Architect to:

☐ Proceed with Additional Services
☐ Proceed with revised scope of services
☐ Incur Reimbursable Expenses
☐ As follows:

Add asbestos abatement to the scope of abatement services in the Contract. Architect will contract with abatement consultant T.K. Matt and Associates, Inc. for abatement plans and specifications, abatement project management, air monitoring, air sampling and testing during asbestos and lead in paint abatement. Architect will review abatement plans and specifications, assemble bidding and contract documents, participate in bidding, and meet with abatement consultant at job site on a weekly basis or as-needed basis. Architect will not be responsible for the abatement procedures, which responsibility lies with the licensed abatement consultant.

Compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

Increase of Twenty-six Thousand, Two Hundred Seventy Dollars ($26,270). The fee increase includes twenty (20) lead samples taken to confirm lead in the historic paint. Additional samples, if indicated by results of sampling, will be charged at seventeen dollars ($17.00) each.

Time for performance shall be adjusted as follows:

No change in over-all time of contract

Upon return of a fully executed authorization, this service shall become a part of the Agreement identified above.

APPROVED BY:

NAME __________________________  NAME __________________________

Dallas County  James Pratt Architecture Urban Design, Inc.

BY __________________________  BY __________________________

TITLE __________________________  TITLE Vice President

DATE __________________________  DATE __________________________
March 20, 2001

1645 Stemmons Fwy. #2
Dallas, Texas 75207

Re: Air Monitoring Services, Asbestos/Lead Sampling & Testing: Dallas County
Old Red Court House, 100 S. Houston, Dallas, Texas.

T.K. Matt and Associates, Inc. is pleased to submit this proposal for project
management, air monitoring, air sampling and testing during asbestos and lead
in paint abatement procedures. T.K. Matt and Associates proposes to provide
these services at a unit charge basis according to the rates shown below.

**Lead:**
- Consultant: 120 hrs. @ $40.00/hr = $4800.00
- Project manager: 250 hrs. @ $30.00/hr = 7500.00
- Air monitor technician: 250 hrs. @ $25.00/hr = 6250.00
- Clerical: 180 hrs. @ $10.00/hr = 1800.00
- Laboratory: 35 samples @ $15.00/sample = 525.00
- Abatement plan/specification = 1700.00
- Drafting: 40 hrs. @ $45.00/hr = 1800.00
- Mileage: 840 mi. @ $0.25/mi = 210.00
- **Total:** $28,235.00

**Lead in Paint Sampling:**
- Consultant: 15 hrs. @ $40.00/hr = 600.00
- Project manager: 20 hrs. @ $30.00/hr = 600.00
- Inspector: 20 hrs. @ $25.00/hr = 500.00
- Clerical: 15 hrs. @ $11.50/hr = 172.50
- Mileage: 48 hrs. @ $0.25/mi = 12.00
- Lead bulk samples: 20 @ $17.00/sample = 340.00
- **Total:** $2,227.60

**Asbestos:**
- Consultant: 120 hrs. @ $21.00/hr = $2520.00
- Project manager: 450 hrs. @ $20.00/hr = 9000.00
- Air monitor technician: 450 hrs. @ $20.00/hr = 9000.00
- Clerical: 300 hrs @ $10.00/hr = 3000.00
- Abatement plan/specification = 1620.00
- Report generation = 70.00
- Laboratory: 120 samples @ $6.00/sample = 720.00
- Mileage: 1080 mi @ $0.35/mi = 378.00
- **Total:** $26,308.00
Total amount of proposal for lead and asbestos for the above referenced project: $54,770.50. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit this proposal. If you have any questions concerning this proposal, please feel free to contact us at (972) 243-4194.

T.K. Matt and Associates, Inc.

Tony O. Ediale, Geologist/Licensed Consultant: License #10-5161 (TDH)
Old Red Court House – 100 South Houston, Street, Dallas, Texas
Cost Estimate – Asbestos Abatement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>ACM</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost per sf/lf</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Vinyl floor tile/mastic</td>
<td>7800 sf</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>27,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceiling spray (1 rm.)</td>
<td>270 sf</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>2,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceiling texture (1 rm.)</td>
<td>240 sf</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>1,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Vinyl floor tile/mastic</td>
<td>6300 sf</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>22,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe elbow wrapping (1)</td>
<td>4 lf</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian rm. Ceiling txt.</td>
<td>48 sf</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>312.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage rm. (1) ceiling txt.</td>
<td>72 sf</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vinyl floor tile/mastic</td>
<td>7800 sf</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>27,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceiling spray (1 rm.)</td>
<td>240 sf</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>1,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vinyl floor tile/mastic</td>
<td>5800 sf</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>20,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acoustical spray</td>
<td>1350 sf</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basement: Pipe joints, elbows, tees throughout: 92lf

Total asbestos abatement amount: $116,783.00
Air monitoring services during asbestos abatement: $26,270.00

Total amount: Asbestos abatement/Air monitoring: $145,053.00
PROGRAM: Major Building  PROJECT: Old Red Courthouse Renovation

Project Description
Renovation of the Old Red Courthouse is being funded through a partnership between community groups and Dallas County. While the upper floors of the building will likely be used for working courtrooms, lower floors will be dedicated to a museum and meeting space. The community group (Old Red Courthouse, Inc.) has agreed to raise $10 million to restore the grand staircase, the clock tower, antique lunettes, and to fund museum exhibits.

Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture/Engineering*</td>
<td>107,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Acquisition</td>
<td>5,130,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,237,500</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,237,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Budget Impact
Depending on the financial success of the museum, additional County maintenance and security staff may be required.

Revenue or Efficiency Offset
Some use of the upper floors of the building (i.e., Probate Courts) may preclude the need to provide Additional space.

Alternatives to Capital Outlay
The building has been leased to a non-profit corporation that intends to raise private funds for a museum. The final configuration of the building may modify somewhat the mix of public and private funding required.

* An additional $462,500 is available in FY2001 through a state grant for architectural and engineering services.
### Project Name
Old Red Repair and Restoration Phase I

### Responsible Department
Assistant Administrator

### Project Manager
Dan Savage

### Date of Report
April 3, 2001

### Project Description
Phase I reconstruction of Old Red Courthouse

### Briefing Date
January 16, 2001

### Court Order Date
January 23, 2001, CO 2001-194

### A&E Firm/Award Date
James Pratt Architects/January 23, 2001

### Contractor/Award Date

### Funding Source
Texas Historical Commission Grant - $462,000, FY 2001 Capital development program $70,800.

### Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified Estimate</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-City of Dallas of Water Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Delay (Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Feb. 2001</td>
<td>Feb. 2001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Aug. 2001</td>
<td>Aug. 2001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-City of Dallas of Water Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>$533,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minority Contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Participating (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Participation ($)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

The Phase I project work includes exterior stone repair, window replacement, selective demolition of non-historic finishout, hazardous material removal and structural reinforcement. Bids will be reviewed on March 29, 2001 for selective demolition of non-historic finish out.
April 10, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

From: Mattye Mauldin-Taylor, Ph.D.
Director of Personnel Civil Service

Subject: Renewal of Reinsurance for Self-Insured Medical Benefits Plans

Background
The Dallas County Commissioners Court approved, through Court Order 2001-235, renewal of
the reinsurance policy for the self-insured medical plans with American Fidelity Assurance
Company for Plan Year 2001. Attachment 1 is the Renewal Application for Plan Year 2001 that
requires signature.

Impact on Operations
Without the reinsurance policy in place to stop losses at a stated level, the County’s budget could
be impacted and other programs interrupted.

Financial Impact
The reinsurance policy protects the County’s self-insured medical plans from catastrophic losses
for the year. An estimated $41,473.00 annual premium, based on the number of participants in
the plans, is budgeted in, and will be paid from, the Benefit Trust.

Recommendation
The Personnel/Civil Service Department recommends the Commissioners Court approve the
renewal and authorize the County Judge to sign renewal related documents on behalf of the
County.

Recommended by: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D.
Director of Personnel/Civil Service

Attachment

501 Main Street, Room 103
Criminal Courts Building
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 653-7638

Equal Opportunity Employer
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APPLICATION/SCHEDULE FOR EXCESS LOSS POLICY

1. Full legal name of Policyholder (YOU, YOUR):
   PEBD-Dallas County

2. Principal Office Address:
   616 Six Flags Drive, Suite 200 Arlington TX 75011

3. Contact Person:


5. If Employee Welfare Benefit Plans of subsidiary or affiliated companies (companies under common control through stock ownership, contract, or otherwise) are to be included, list legal names and addresses of such companies and the nature of their business:

6. Full name of YOUR Employee Welfare Benefit Plan:

   A copy of YOUR ERISA Employee Welfare Benefit Plan Document, and those of any subsidiary or affiliated companies that are to be included, must be attached to, and shall form a part of, this Application/Schedule. If YOUR Employee Welfare Benefit Plan is for a MEWA (Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangement) or an MET (Multiple Employer Trust), YOUR Application/Schedule will not be accepted for consideration unless YOU provide a clear and concise statement from the U.S. Department of Labor that it is exempt from ERISA requirements.

7. Requested Effective Date: January 1, 2001

8. Requested Endorsements: AMD-8025

9. OUR Underwriting Manager: ASU Services LLC

10. YOUR Designated Third-Party Administrator (for the purposes of claims administration under YOUR Employee Welfare Benefit Plan):
    Name: North Texas Alliance d.b.a. Employer's Services
    Address: 5501 N. MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 300
    City, State, Zip: Irving, TX 75038
    Telephone: 1(972)751-0047

11. YOUR broker/agent of record:
    Name: N/A
    Address: N/A
    City, State, Zip: N/A
    Telephone: N/A
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12. COVERAGES REQUESTED / SCHEDULE

The Coverage shown applies only during the Policy Period from January 1, 2001 (Effective Date) through December 31, 2001 (Expiration Date) and is further subject to all the provisions of the Policy.

A. SPECIFIC EXCESS LOSS COVERAGE  ☒ Yes, included  ☐ No, not included

1) Coverages to be included:

☒  ☐ Medical
☒  ☐ Prescription Drug Service:

NOTE: In no event will Dental, Vision, or Weekly Income be included under Specific Excess Loss.

2) Specific Attachment Point (unless adjusted by Endorsement):

☒  ☐ Per Covered Person: $250,000.00
☐  ☐ Per Covered Family: $________________

3) Specific Reimbursement Percentage: 100%

4) Specific Lifetime Maximum Reimbursement per Covered Person: $1,000,000.00

☒  ☐ Of this amount, reimbursement for treatment of drug or alcohol abuse will be limited to:

☒  ☐ $100% after $15 copayment

☒  ☐ 3 episodes of care for each covered person’s lifetime days

☐  ☐ ______ days, up to $________________

☐  ☐ Treatment of drug or alcohol abuse considered as any other illness

5) Basis of Specific Excess Loss coverage benefit payment (Benefit Period):

Plan Benefits Incurred from January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001
and Paid from January 1, 2001 through March 30, 2002

Plan Benefits Incurred prior to the Effective Date (Run-In Period) will be limited to:

☒  ☐ $N/A per Covered Person
☐  ☐ $N/A for all Covered Persons combined

6) Premium Rates (per month):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Unit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Covered Unit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>$6.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Minimum Annual Specific Premium: $25,575.14
B. AGGREGATE EXCESS LOSS INSURANCE  ☑ Yes, included  ☐ No, not included

1) Coverages to be included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prescription Drug Service: 
Weekly income: Maximum , per covered employee per Policy Period:

☐ ☑ Other: 

2) Monthly Aggregate Factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Prescription Drug Service</th>
<th>Weekly Income</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>$599.58</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ Included</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$599.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Number of Covered Units:  ☑ Quoted  ☐ Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Prescription Drug Service</th>
<th>Weekly Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>4066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Minimum Annual Aggregate Attachment Point: $27,303,027.36
   (12 times Monthly Aggregate Factor(s), times total Number of Covered Units)

5) Aggregate Reimbursement Percentage: 100%

6) Individual Claim Limit: $250,000.00

7) Maximum Aggregate Reimbursement (per Policy Period): $1,000,000.00

8) Basis of Aggregate Excess Loss coverage benefit payment (Benefit Period):
   Plan Benefits Incurred from January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001
   and Paid from January 1, 2001 through March 30, 2002
   Plan Benefits Incurred prior to the Effective Date (Run-In Period) will be limited to:
   ☐ $ N/A per Covered Person
   ☑ $ N/A for all Covered Persons combined

9) Premium Rates (per month):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Unit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Minimum Annual Aggregate Premium $3,456.10
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13. Eligible for coverage:

Yes* No
☒ ☐ Retired Employees
☒ ☐ COBRA Continuees
☒ ☐ Disabled Employees
☒ ☐ Transplants

* All “Yes” answers must have disclosure information attached to this Application/Schedule.

14. Initial premium deposit accompanying the application: $____________

15. Minimum Plan Enrollment: 4066 Covered Units, or 75% of initial enrollment

YOU have read the foregoing and understand and agree with the terms and conditions of the coverage as set forth by US and as reflected in this Application/Schedule. YOU represent that YOU have formed YOUR Employee Welfare Benefit Plan in compliance with and in reliance on the applicable provisions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), as amended, or any other applicable law or regulation. It is agreed that the statements in this Application/Schedule or in any materials submitted with this Application/Schedule or attached to it are YOUR representations and shall be deemed material to acceptance of the risk by US and that the Policy is issued by US in reliance on the truth and accuracy of such representations. Should subsequent information become known which, if known prior to issuance of the Policy, would affect the premium rates, factors, terms or conditions for coverage thereunder, WE will have the right to revise the premium rates, factors, terms or conditions as of the Effective Date, by providing written notice to YOU. Any fraudulent statement will render the Policy null and void and claims, if any, will be forfeited.

THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT BIND COVERAGE. Upon approval of the application, the Policy evidencing that the coverage is in force will be issued by US through OUR Underwriting Manager. Coverage will commence on the Effective Date set forth in the Policy.

WARNING: Any person who knowingly, and with intent to injure, defraud or deceive any insurer, makes any claim for the proceeds of an insurance policy containing any false, incomplete or misleading information may be guilty of insurance fraud.

ACCEPTED BY THE POLICYHOLDER:

Signed at ____________________________

Date ____________________________

By (Officer’s name and title)

__ PEBE-Dallas County
Policyholder (correct legal name)

__ Policyholder’s Broker/Agent of Record

ACCEPTED BY THE COMPANY:

Signed at ASU Services Danvers, MA 01923

Date ____________

On behalf of the Company

Beth Sneider Vice President Underwriting / Marketing

By (Officer’s name and title)
Specific Advance Option

This provision is only applicable if indicated as included on the Application/Schedule.

1. AVAILABILITY OF SPECIFIC ADVANCE. The Specific Advance is available when a Policyholder's Plan sustains losses that:
   a. exceed the Specific Attachment Point, plus $1,000.00;
   b. are determined in accord with the Policyholder's Plan Document; and
   c. are processed for payment before the Policy Period ends.

2. REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC ADVANCE. To receive a Specific Advance, the Policyholder must send the Company a written request, along with proof that the Policyholder has paid up to the Specific Attachment Point plus $1,000.00 and any other required documentation. The Company must receive this proof prior to the end of the Policy Period.

3. USE OF REIMBURSEMENT. Within five calendar days after receiving the Company's reimbursement, the Policyholder must:
   a. pay the benefits described in 1.; and
   b. deposit the Company's reimbursement draft.

   In no event may the Company's reimbursement draft be deposited before the benefits described in 1. have been paid. If the benefits are not paid within the five-day period, the reimbursement draft must be returned to the Company. The Policyholder must supply proof of such benefit payments, at the Company's request.

4. REFUND OF ANY UNUSED AMOUNT. If, for any reason, part of the reimbursement is not used to pay the eligible losses described in 1., then the Policyholder must refund the unused amount to the Company. This refund must be made within five business days after receiving the Company's reimbursement draft.

If the Policyholder fails to comply with the above conditions, the Policyholder's right to receive the Specific Advance shall be revoked. The Company does not waive any rights under this Excess Loss Insurance Policy by adding this provision.

By YOUR authorized representative's signature below, YOU are verifying that YOU have read and understand the terms of this Endorsement, and YOUR obligations hereunder.

Signed for AMERICAN FIDELITY ASSURANCE COMPANY

[Signature]

Secretary

Endorsement Number: 1
Effective Date: January 1, 2001
Excess Loss Policy Number: AFA-SLP-2000-048-ASU
Policyholder Name: PEBC-Dallas County
Signature of Policyholder's Authorized Representative: ____________________________
Authorized Representative's Title: ____________________________
Date Signed: ____________________________
April 9, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

Through: Ryan Brown
Acting Budget Officer

From: Amanda S. Perez
Budget & Policy Analyst

Subject: Request for New Positions in the Grants Division

BACKGROUND

Dallas County Health and Human Services Grants Division oversees four grants related to the services provided for HIV/AIDS clients. These grants, Ryan White Title I and II, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and State Services, total $17 million for FY2001. Health and Human Services is designated to serve as the Administrative Agency for these funds for the Dallas Eligible Metropolitan Area. Specifically, the Ryan White Title I grant is $12,098,406 in FY2001. Of this, $553,852, or 4.6% of the total award, has been requested to be allocated for the Administrative Agency. Overall, 5% of the total award is eligible for the administrative purposes of Title I funds.

The Grants Division has maintained two planning groups to assist the Grants Division in a number of areas including: establishing priorities for the allocation of funds within the service area, developing a comprehensive plan for the organization and delivery of health services that is compatible with the eligible area, and assessing the effectiveness through its contractual arrangements. The two planning committees are divided by the funds in which they monitor. The Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) has approximately 25 individuals and is tasked with the Title I and HOPWA funds. The Ryan White Consortium of North Texas (Consortium) is a larger group consisting of about 60 individuals which prepares the same planning for Title II and State Services funds.

On March 27, 2001, Commissioners Court was briefed on contracts with service providers for Ryan White funds, in addition to being advised on the funds needed for the Administrative Agency's budget, the program support budget, and the Ryan White Planning Council's budget. The department would like to pursue the reclassification and addition of certain positions in this area. The purpose of this briefing is to make a recommendation on these requested grant positions.
OPERATIONAL IMPACT

The department’s request includes four additional positions and three reclassifications in the Ryan White Division. A description of the duties of each position is provided in the following paragraphs.

New Positions - A new position titled *RWPC Consortium Manager* is requested. The requested position will work with both of the planning groups to oversee the day to day operations of each group, ad-hoc committee, and seven standing committees. The position will serve as the chief liaison to the chairs of the committees and officers and will help to manage the budgets of both councils pursuant to federal and state regulations. Two reclassified positions, the Professional Health Planner and the Planning Council Administrative Coordinator, will also report to this position. With no current position of this type, these responsibilities are spread among current staff. **OBE recommends the addition of the RWPC Consortium Manager position to the Ryan White division.**

A second request is for a position titled *Grants Management Officer*. This individual will be tasked to oversee the day to day operations (17 staff members) of the Grants Division in the absence of the Assistant Director. In the recent HHS reorganization, the request to have the current Assistant Director of Grants oversee the Welfare Division was recommended and approved. However, an additional position to manage the Grants Division in the Assistant Director’s absence was not requested nor foreseen.

Currently, the department has a Grants Manager position on staff. However, the position is intended to be utilized for financial grant issues. The position is responsible for fiscal reporting, contractual billings and spending, and reallocation of funds. The current workload does not allow the position to play this dual role being requested. In the absence of the Assistant Director (who spends approximately 50% of the day within the Welfare Division), the ongoing duties are still demanded. A position is being requested to perform the following duties: the development of grant applications (each one requiring 2 – 5 months to prepare), the preparation of TDH quarterly reporting statistics, and the completion of close out reports. With a documented full caseload, **OBE recommends the addition of a Grants Management Officer to the Grants Division.**

A third request has been presented for a *Cost Effectiveness Consultant*. This position is requested by the State. This employee will collaborate with TDH and DCHHS to facilitate a standardized cost based reimbursement for grant-funded HIV services. The individual will be housed at Dallas County, but will travel throughout Texas assisting TDH-funded administrative agencies in implementing cost-based strategies. The individual will work with TDH to educate and provide support based on the practices of Dallas County. **Recommended by OBE.**

Lastly, a request has been presented for a *Quality Assurance Advisor*. The position will be responsible for client satisfaction and the development of a quality assurance plan for the services being monitored in the Grants Division. This position will collaborate with the 24 contracted agencies providing the continuum of care of HIV/AIDS clients. There are currently 27 various service categories assisting 6,500 clients. The position will conduct surveys and provide statistical analysis of the outcomes of the services being provided for continued improvement. **Recommended by OBE.**
Reclassifications – Requests have been presented for the reclassification of three current positions. First is the reclassification of the HIV Services Planner to Professional Health Planner. This position was originally created to assist the coordination of the activities of the RWPC, develop mechanisms to conduct needs assessment, and analyze results of those assessments. It is requested that this position, now also assisting the Consortium, will facilitate and implement the planning studies and data analysis. The position will require epidemiological and statistical skills to appropriately perform these tasks. As of April 1, Ryan White assistance will cover a 12 county region vs. the current 8 county area. Recommended for review.

Second, there is a request for review of two administrative assistants. The first is the administrative assistant, for the title of Planning Council Administrative Coordinator. This position was originally established to assist with the clerical duties of the planning council. The request is for this position be reviewed for additional duties with the planning councils. The position would coordinate council information and report detailed information from these meetings per new federal regulations. The request is to have the position have a minimum of a bachelor’s degree for the purpose of preparing the proper data packages and report minutes that are required to include more detail.

The second administrative assistant is being requested for an upgraded position of Administrative Analyst. This position that once had the same duties as previously mentioned has evolved into more technical requirements. This position has collected and submitted the regulated reporting of the providers with whom the Administrative Agency contracts. The reports generated to TDH are the responsibility of this individual, who is now required to pass statewide testing standards. This position is also preferred to have a bachelor’s degree. Recommended for review.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no impact to the General Fund. Each additional position and reclassification is entirely grant funded through Ryan White funds. Currently the Ryan White division does not utilize the full allotted percentage of its grants for administrative purposes. The estimated additional funds required through the grants will be $249,760. New on-going funds from TDH will be available in FY2001 for administrative personnel. TDH has stipulated that these new funds are intended to support additional administrative expenses and are not available for direct client services. The intent of these funds is to help the Administrative Agency improve its planning, monitoring, and evaluating activities. In addition, Dallas County will receive full indirect costs from the Ryan White grants.

RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that the positions of RWPC/Consortium Manager, Grant Management Officer, Cost Effectiveness Consultant, and Quality Assurance Advisor be added to the Grants Division as well as a review for reclassification of the HIV Services Planner and the two administrative assistant positions.
Dallas Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC)/Ryan White Consortium of North Texas (Consortium)
Support Staff

Job Title: RWPC/Consortium Manager
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade I/Recommended
Reports to: RWPC/Consortium Chair and Dallas County Health and Human Services Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance

Job Summary:
The RWPC/Consortium Manager's responsibilities shall be as follows:

- Provide direction to both the RWPC/Consortium and its support staff toward the complete and legal fulfillment of all RWPC/Consortium responsibilities as set out in law, regulations, and policies.
- Manage the budget of the RWPC/Consortium support in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.
- Provide day-to-day management of the RWPC/Consortium activities and staff.
- Provide day-to-day management of the support staff operations and be responsible for interviewing, evaluating, and recommending termination of staff in consultation with the RWPC/Consortium chair and the DCHHS Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance.

Qualifications (Skills and Experience):

- Master's degree in public/community health, health administration, business management, or related health science field.
- Five years management experience, including direct supervision of community health programs.
- Demonstrated skills in policy development and interpretation of law, regulations, and grant policy.
- Proven ability in analyzing behavioral, social, and demographic data and trends.
- Knowledge of behavioral, social and/or urban research applications, methodologies and procedures including statistics.
- Knowledge and experience using advanced microcomputer capabilities and demonstrated skill with spreadsheets (Excel), statistical software (SPSS), database (Access), presentation (Power Point) and mapping applications.
- Demonstrates strong written and oral communication skills, including public speaking.
- Ability to work with a broad base of community members, including volunteers, and the ability to disseminate information to people with various levels of technical expertise.

The RWPC/Consortium manager shall have overall management responsibility for the following:

- 15% E Devise and present to the RWPC/Consortium, on an annual basis, a timeline for the work of the Dallas RWPC/Consortium.
- 20% E Act as the RWPC/Consortium's point of request for public information and act as a liaison with and between the RWPC/Consortium, its standing committees, ad hoc committees, and the Administrative Agent.
- 15% E Facilitate and enhance regional cooperation among other planning councils, consortia, service providers, consumers, and constituent communities.
- 25% E Assist the RWPC/Consortium and or its committees in responding to funding source recommendations, including assisting with interpretations of law, regulations, and policy. Then develop and facilitate a process to adopt and implement these changes in a timely manner, as approved by RWPC/Consortium, including drafting and introducing policy to the RWPC/Consortium.
- 25% E Support and carry out all RWPC/Consortium mandates and initiatives as approved by the RWPC/Consortium and in accordance with funding source agencies/grantors and local county regulations.
DALLAS COUNTY JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title: Grants Management Officer
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade K/Recommended
Reports to: Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance

Job Summary:
Grants Management Officer (GMO) oversees day-to-day operations of the Grants Division in the absence of the Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance. GMO needs to possess knowledge of Federal, State, and local HIV/AIDS health and social service agencies and grants. Needs to have skills related to public health and human services management and administration. GMO must also demonstrate an ability to understand issues related to HIV/AIDS program and fiscal compliance, quality assurance, outcome assessment, cost effectiveness, data interpretation and evaluation, and program planning.

Management Scope:
In absence of Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance, supervises 17-member staff and oversees 20 sub-recipient agencies receiving funds from five federal and State grants totaling over $17 million.

Duties and Responsibilities
20% E In absence of Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance, oversees the day-to-day operations of 17-member staff, including hiring, training, and evaluation.

20% E Reviews Federal and State legislation, policies, and procedures relevant to HIV/AIDS health and social service programs. Helps to ensure compliance with Federal, State, and local legislation, policies, and procedures by the County, sub-recipient agencies, and governing bodies.

20% E Oversees the procurement process to sub-recipient agencies, including development of requests for proposals.

20% E Oversees components of grant application and grant compliance reporting for five Federal and State grants.

5% N Assesses the effectiveness of the current health and social services delivery system for a twelve-county area.

5% N Develops collaborative relationships between local, regional, and State representatives to further develop an effective continuum of care for a twelve-county region.

5% N Serves as a liaison for Dallas County, communicating HIV/AIDS service-related information, between grantors (USDHHS, USHUD, and TDH), sub-recipient agencies, and community groups.

5% N Performs other duties as assigned.

Minimum Qualifications
Must possess education and experience equivalent to a master's degree from an accredited college or university. Preferred degree is in public health, law, and/or business.
DALLAS COUNTY JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title: Cost Effectiveness Consultant
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade K/Recommended
Reports to: Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance

Job Summary
The Cost Effectiveness Consultant (CEC) will work in collaboration with the Texas Department of Health (TDH) and Dallas County Health and Human Services (DCHHS) to facilitate a standardized cost-based reimbursement/unit cost reimbursement for grant funded HIV health and social services in Dallas County and across the state of Texas. CEC needs to possess knowledge of HIV-related health and social services – especially related to cost and scope of work. Needs to have written and verbal presentation skills. CEC must also demonstrate an ability to provide consultation and training to TDH and DCHHS personnel.

Management Scope
None

Duties and Responsibilities
20% Work with the TDH External Workgroup on Cost-Based Reimbursement. Specific focus will be on developing a standardized HIV/AIDS health and social services taxonomy, review of policies and procedures associated with procurement, and exploration of fiscal monitoring issues.

20% Work with TDH and selected consultants to develop reference and implementation materials to guide and assist TDH and TDH-funded administrative agencies as they implement cost-based reimbursement strategies.

15% To travel to TDH and TDH-funded administrative agencies in order to provide on-site training and technical assistance to relevant staff.

15% Provide off-site training, technical assistance, and support to TDH and TDH-funded administrative agencies via telephone, fax, and e-mail communications.

10% Facilitate joint meetings with TDH and TDH-funded administrative agencies on issues related to cost-based reimbursement strategies. Develop conference presentations and materials to be used for disbursement at TDH-sponsored events.

10% Evaluate the implementation of cost-based reimbursement strategies among TDH-funded administrative agencies and develop contingency plans to correct barriers or delays as they occur. Identify geographic areas having difficulties with unit cost implementation as well as geographic areas having high levels of success. Highlight best-case examples and areas in need of improvement.

10% Prepare annual reports on activities, including an assessment of the statewide unit cost implementation and suggestions for training needs.

Minimum Qualifications
Must possess education and experience equivalent to a master's degree from an accredited college or university. Preferred degree is in public health and/or business.
DALLAS COUNTY JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title: Quality Assurance Advisor
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade G Recommended
Reports to: Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance

Job Summary:
Quality Assurance Advisor (QAA) will develop and implement a quality assurance program that will increase community access to high-quality HIV-related care for a twelve county region. This position works with sub-recipient agencies (currently 24 agencies, providing services to 6,500 clients) that are funded with Dallas County pass through grants to provide a continuum of care (consisting of 27 service categories). QAA needs to possess knowledge of and experience in client satisfaction surveys and evaluation for HIV health and social services. Needs to have skills related to statistical analysis, program evaluation, and implementation of quality assurance plans. QAA must also demonstrate an ability to develop tools related to monitoring quality assurance and program compliance.

Management Scope:
None.

Duties and Responsibilities
25% E Develop quality assurance plan that will ensure improved access to client services for 6,500 clients within a twelve county region.
40% E Conduct client satisfaction evaluations for HIV services provided by grants administered by Dallas County Health and Human Services (covering 27 service categories).
25% E From these evaluations, assesses the quality of the current health and social services delivery system for a twelve-county area by analyzing and evaluating client services.
5% E Assists with components of grant application and grant compliance reporting for five federal and State grants.
5% N Performs other duties as assigned.

Minimum Qualifications
Must possess education and experience equivalent to a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university. Preferred degree is in public health and/or business. Two (2) to four (4) years of additional experience required.
Dallas Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC)/Ryan White Consortium of North Texas (Consortium) Support Staff

Job Title: Professional Health Planner
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade G/Recommended
Reports to: RWPC/Consortium Manager

Job Summary:
This position will promote a system-wide approach to HIV/AIDS services planning. This position will plan and facilitate the implementation of research and planning studies needed to support the achievement of RWPC/Consortium's strategic goals in all functional areas, including fund allocation, public policy, and public information. Responsibilities will include facilitating collaboration among HIV/AIDS researchers, service providers, policy makers, and members of target populations in comprehensive planning activities, and providing technical assistance to the RWPC/Consortium.

Qualifications (Skills and Experience)
- Master's degree in public/community health, health administration, or related health science field or equivalent professional experience.
- Two years related work experience.
- Proven ability in analyzing behavioral, social, and demographic data and trends. Knowledge of behavioral, social and/or urban research applications, methodologies and procedures including statistics.
- Knowledge and experience using advanced microcomputer capabilities and demonstrated skill with spreadsheets (Excel), statistical software (SPSS), database (Access), presentation (Power Point) and mapping applications.
- Demonstrates strong written and oral communication skills, including public speaking.
- Ability to work with a broad base of community members, including volunteers, and the ability to disseminate information to people with various levels of technical expertise.

Primary Responsibilities
- 30% E Assists the Ryan White Support Staff Office and RWPC/Consortium as requested in strategic planning, data analysis, and evaluation in various activities, which may include HIV/AIDS service delivery and fund resources/needs across service categories.
- 20% E Responsible for planning and implementing assessments of local HIV/AIDS related community resources and needs, including: organizing, conducting and analyzing results of focus groups, designing, supervising and analyzing results of surveys; collecting and analyzing secondary research data; analyzing and communicating findings; utilizing oral and written reports, charts, graphs, and maps.
- 20% E Coordinate special research projects, such as service effectiveness studies, comprehensive needs assessments, and quality assurance initiatives.
- 10% E Prepare/update the Comprehensive Plan to develop, organize, coordinate and implement more effective and cost-effective systems of essential services to individuals and families with HIV disease across a 12-county area.
- 10% E Conduct epidemiological studies of HIV/AIDS.
- 10% E Attend meetings and present reports to the RWPC/Consortium and related committees.
Dallas Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC)/Ryan White Consortium of North Texas (Consortium)

Support Staff

Job Title: Planning Council Administrative Coordinator
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade C/Recommended
Reports to: RWPC/Consortium Manager

Job Summary:
This position serves as the primary coordinator of Council information and activities. Position is responsible for scheduling and preparing materials for all RWPC/Consortium and committee meetings. Responsible for maintaining compliance with the “Open Meetings Act”, and providing information to community members in a manner that will most likely allow their complete participation in applicable activities. Assists volunteers in responding to recommendations and mandates. Under the direction of the RWPC/Consortium manager, facilitates RWPC/Consortium processes to ensure the support, implementation, and continuation of all RWPC/Consortium mandates and initiatives in accordance with federal and local regulations.

Qualifications:
• Bachelor’s degree (any field) preferred.
• One year related work experience.
• Demonstrates strong written and oral communication skills, including public speaking.
• Ability to disseminate information to people with various levels of technical expertise.

Primary Responsibilities:
• 60% E Responsible for creating and maintaining all meeting documentation including agendas, official minutes and tape recordings in an up-to-date and organized manner.
• 10% E Responsible for forwarding and receiving Council-related information to/from the RWPC/Consortium-related information to/from the Council, committees, the public, etc. as directed.
• 10% E Assist in putting together all mail outs and ensuring, to the extent possible, the mailouts are received by a date that allows for the reading and/or use of the materials in advance of any applicable meeting.
• 5% N Maintain the RWPC/Consortium archives of minutes, notices, attachments, etc.
• 5% N Update information for the RWPC Orientation Manual.
• 5% N Assist in securing locations and preparing materials to be used/needed at all meetings and for making sure those materials are at the meetings in advance.
• 5% N Other duties as assigned.
Dallas County Job Description

Job Title: Administrative Analyst
Status: Exempt
Salary: Grade C/Recommended
Reports to: Assistant Director for Client Services and Federal Grants Compliance

Job Summary:
Assists the DCHHS Grants Division in the review of the sub-recipient HIV services agencies funded with Dallas County pass-through grants with COMPIS data collection and reporting requirements. This position has primary responsibility for coding, maintenance, review and correction of information, which is submitted to the funding agencies and community planning bodies. Provides technical assistance training to large and small group settings.

Qualifications:
- Bachelor’s degree in computer science preferred or eight years related experience or a combination of the two.
- Must have passed data manager’s proficiency exam through the Texas Department of Health.
- Demonstrates strong written and oral communication skills;
- Ability to disseminate information to people with various levels of technical expertise;
- Demonstrates problem solving and decision making skills;
- Knowledge of spreadsheets, databases, and various word processing packages.

Primary Responsibilities:
- 60% E Responsible for monitoring and maintaining all COMPIS data collection.
- 15% E Responsible for forwarding and receiving client level data on services delivered by sub-recipient agencies.
- 15% E Provides technical assistance training to sub-recipient agencies as needed.
- 5% N Works with grantor agencies as needed regarding data collection systems.
- 5% N Other duties as assigned.
To: Commissioners Court

From: J. Allen Clemson, Administrator

Subject: Contract Jail Health and Development of a secure Jail Health Inpatient/Outpatient Facility

BACKGROUND OF ISSUE

The Commissioners Court was briefed on issues relating to jail health on November 21, 2000 and again on March 13, 2001 with specific emphasis on jail physician salaries and levels of care. As part of each briefing the Commissioners Court was informed of possible operational and service issues that could be addressed by using a contract jail health provider. After the Commissioners Court's initial briefing on jail health issues, Commissioners Court staff along with Ms. Lister, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Brown and Dallas County Hospital District staff consisting of Dr. Ron Anderson, Dr. Sam Ross and Nina McIntosh met with representatives of the University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston (UTMB Galveston) to discuss in more detail how contract jail health might work in Dallas County jails.

UTMB Galveston was selected for this initial discussion as they had notified Dallas County Sheriff Jim Bowles on October 24, 2000 of their offer to provide jail health care to all Dallas County inmates at a cost of $3.60 per day. Using a projected jail population of 5,700 inmates, Dallas County's jail health cost would be $7,489,800 if UTMB Galveston was utilized. At the conclusion of this discussion, it was decided that Dallas County and the Dallas County Hospital District should determine its actual and total costs for jail health. The County's Health and Human Services cost was readily known; however, the services provided by the Dallas County Hospital District for pharmacy and inpatient/outpatient care had to be calculated.

On April 4, 2001 I received a copy of the Dallas County Hospital District's analysis of the Hospital District's total costs for jail health which included Dallas County Health & Human Services' jail health budget, Parkland Hospital's jail drug costs, Parkland Hospital's jail drug salary and supply costs, Parkland Hospital inpatient costs and Parkland Hospital outpatient costs for a total of $12,834,205. Our initial review of this information shows an estimated savings of as much as $5,000,000.

Staff is considering the projected cost savings with caution as it is not clear to what extent juvenile health care, jail intake screening and the mental health care program operated in Dallas County jails.
would be provided within the UTMB Galveston’s $3.60 per day rate. A more realistic or conservative savings estimate would be to increase the projected cost for UTMB Galveston that was based on the 5,700 County inmate population by the cost of what we are currently spending for juvenile health, jail intake and psychiatric care. This more conservative approach projects contract cost to be $9,532,300 which suggests a savings of approximately $3,000,000.

In the initial review of UTMB Galveston’s proposal, it was evident that they are a highly sophisticated provider of health care with a well-established correctional health managed care program which utilizes established national standards of care. An additional issue that has been mentioned in the Commissioners Court on several occasions and more recently by Commissioners Price and Jackson during a recent Sheriff’s Liaison meeting is the development of a secure jail health facility that would offer a safe and more efficient way of providing inpatient and outpatient care to County inmates without requiring their transportation and commingling with the free population.

The purpose of this briefing is to present the operational and cost benefit opportunity of a contract jail health program as well as discuss the process that could be used to finally determine the feasibility and practicality of developing a secure full-service jail health facility.

**IMPACT ON OPERATIONS**

Contract versus in-house jail health should not negatively impact the quality or quantity of services to be provided. As was discussed in our meeting with the UTMB Galveston, existing employees providing direct care in the jails would in many cases continue to provide this care and inpatient and outpatient care would in most cases probably be provided through a contract between UTMB Galveston and the Dallas County Hospital District.

The availability of a secure inpatient and outpatient jail health facility should reduce inmate security costs and if a regional multi-jurisdictional facility could be developed for Federal, State and other County inmates, economy of scale issues could be brought to bear to increase the potential for a more efficient operation.

**PROCESS TO BE FOLLOWED**

If the Commissioners Court and Hospital District wish to explore a contract jail health program, the following steps could be followed:

1) Develop a documented summary of current jail health operations and services in the County jails as well as in Parkland Memorial Hospital.

2) Develop a typical workload or utilization summary that covers a 6 to 12-month period.
3) Invite the UTMB Galveston and Texas Tech Institutional Medical Division, to review the utilization and operational information and tour our facilities. Provide supplemental information as needed.

4) Receive proposals from each and negotiate an interlocal agreement with the preferred provider or reject the proposals and continue to provide services in-house.

The feasibility of a secure inpatient and outpatient facility would be reviewed with each medical provider during the evaluation process as well as with the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, the Federal Prison System and surrounding counties and private jail operators to determine their initial level of interest.

Jurisdictions that are interested would join with Dallas County in the development of a feasibility plan and cost/benefit analysis to determine the desirability of this type of facility. If none of our regional partners are interested, the County should proceed with the Hospital District to identify the opportunities that would be available from developing this type of facility.

**SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2001</td>
<td>Brief the Commissioners Court on jail contract operations and the development of a secure jail health facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 2001 (week of)</td>
<td>Determine the Hospital District's willingness to participate in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2001 (week of)</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting with the Hospital District, Health &amp; Human Services and Sheriff to develop a jail health operational summary and utilization profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2001 (week of)</td>
<td>Send operational summary and utilization profile to jail health providers and schedule a tour of facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2001 (week of)</td>
<td>Receive initial proposals from jail health providers and brief the Hospital District and Commissioners Court on the preliminary results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3, 2001</td>
<td>Hospital District and Commissioner Court select an institutional jail health provider and authorize negotiation of a final contract agreement. If contract providers prove not to be desirable, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
process is terminated and the schedule is modified to address the feasibility of a secure jail health facility.

August 6, 2001 (week of)

Begin initial meetings to determine the level of interest in the development of a regional secure jail health inpatient/outpatient facility.

August 14, 2001

Final approval of a contract agreement for contract jail health services and begin implementation. Complete initial discussions on the level of interest in the development of a regional secure jail health facility and begin development of a feasibility study.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commissioners Court and the Hospital District formally begin the process to determine the benefits to be gained from a contract jail health program as well as a secure multi-jurisdictional inpatient/outpatient jail health facility.

Recommended by:

J. Allen Clemson
Administrator

cc: Betty Culbreath-Lister
    Dr. Ron Anderson
    Dr. Sam Ross
    Nina McIntosh
    Ryan Brown
    Shannon Brown
April 17, 2001

MISCELLANEOUS

1) COUNTY JUDGE - requests permission for Health & Human Services to use the Dallas County logo on magnetic signs with the words "Dallas County Health & Human Services Caring for the Children of Dallas" on a van furnished by the Blue Cross Foundation, specially built for transporting immunization materials for dispensing free immunizations.

2) STAFF - requests permission to place posters announcing the launch of the new County Internet site in the George Allen Courts Building, Records Building, Administration Building, Crowley Courts Building, the JP Courts, and Tax satellite offices.

3) COUNTY CLERK - requests authorization to transfer $9,728 (520 hours) from the County Clerk’s Salaries-Assistant to the Salary-Overtime line item to pay overtime expenses for four employees. Overtime funds are requested in order to decrease a civil case backlog caused by vacancies. Recommended by Office of Budget and Evaluation.

4) PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - requests permission to reallocate $121,800 in CDBG funds from Wilmer’s Goode Road water project to Wilmer’s Dallas Avenue road reconstruction project as has been requested by the City of Wilmer. Court Order is also on Court’s April 17 Formal Agenda so that Road & Bridge District #4 can begin project as soon as possible.

   COURT ORDER ON FORMAL AGENDA

5) CONSTABLE, PCT. #3 (RICHARDSON) - requests permission to fill Deputy Constable position #56 which was to be frozen from February 1-August 31, 2001 for DDA credit. Constable Richardson understands that this will result in him not receiving any DDA credit for the vacancy.
6) **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT** - requests permission to seal the northwest wall of Henry Wade Juvenile Justice Center to prevent water from entering. Estimated cost is $8,000. Funds are available in Fund 126 (Permanent Improvement), FY2001 Budget.

7) **DISTRICT ATTORNEY** - requests:
   
   a) permission to purchase a program entitled "Lexis Nexis Certifinder" which aids in locating individuals. The County has a contract with Lexis Nexis. QISV number 1-31-053-5759-700, and the contract is being expanded to include Certifinder. The cost for this addition will be paid from Local Law Enforcement Block Grant funds. MIS Director recommends.
   
   b) that the new Felony Bureau Chief be assigned an underground secure parking place in the Frank Crowley Parking Garage. By policy, the Commissioners Court provides a parking place to the Elected Official and Chief Deputy. In the District Attorney’s office, the District Attorney, District Attorney First Assistant, District Attorney Chief Investigator and Administrative Attorney have been authorized parking. On this Department Organization Chart this will provide a parking space to 3 out of 8 positions that report to the District Attorney First Assistant.

8) **TAX ASSESSOR/COLLECTOR** - requests permission to transfer $10,000 from Salaries-Extra Help line item to Other Professional Fees line item to fund five clerks from Grove Temps, needed to work on Motor Vehicle mail backlog, for approximately six weeks. The Tax Office has difficulty hiring part time workers with the current job market and wants to utilize the County contract with Grove Temps to bring in the needed manpower. No additional funding is required for this request. Recommended by the Office of Budget & Evaluation.

**TRAVEL REQUESTS**

9) **CONSTABLE, PCT. #4 (GOTHARD)** - Robert Delbosque, Bill Gates, Lori Meyers, Jerry Pittman and David Thompson - State Mandated Civil Process School - Galveston, TX - May 22-25, 2001 in three County vehicles with gas credit card(s) and no other expense to Dallas County.
10) **SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT** - Chief J. Herrera and Captain L. DeVaney - Auto Theft Prevention Authority Staff Meeting - Austin, TX - April 18, 2001 **at no cost to Dallas County** ($70 for food to be paid from NTATTF).

11) **HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES** - requests:

   a) Don Hutcheson - Course in Training Operations to Promote Safety Around Field Encounters (TOPSAFE) - Austin, TX - April 29-May 1, 2001: $505 from Grant Fund, VD Epidemiology Department, Conference Training Account, FY2001 Budget, (00466.8706.02460.2001).

   b) Patricia Cook - The Process of Patient Education (Parkland Health & Hospital System) - Dallas, TX - April 25, 2001 **at no cost to Dallas County**.


**EXCEPTION TO TRAVEL REQUESTS**

**UNLESS SPECIFICALLY OBJECTED TO, ALL ITEMS PRESENTED AS EXCEPTIONS ARE CONSIDERED TO BE APPROVED**


**MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT**

1) **DEPARTMENT:** 4040 Public Defender
   **ITEMS:** 1 - Administrative Chair
   **ESTIMATED COST:** $250
FUNDING SOURCE: Reserves and Contingency, Furniture and Equipment
EXPENDITURE SOURCES: 00120.4040.02090.2001 (General Fund, Public Defender, Property less than $500, FY2001)
PROPOSED ACTION: Chief Public Defender, Jane Roden, requests authorization to purchase one (1) Administrative Chair for the Family Section satellite office in the George Allen Courts Building. Recommended by Office of Budget and Evaluation.

2) DEPARTMENT: 4435
ITEMS: 282nd Criminal District Court - Judge Karen Greene
1 - PC Cart
ESTIMATED COST: $163
FUNDING SOURCE: Reserves and Contingency, Furniture and Equipment
EXPENDITURE SOURCES: 00120.4435.02090.2001 (General Fund, 282nd Criminal District Court, Property less than $500, FY2001)
PROPOSED ACTION: Judge Karen Greene, 282nd Criminal District Court, requests authorization to replace one (1) PC Cart damaged in a flood that occurred in February 2000. Recommended by Office of Budget and Evaluation.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REQUESTS

Telecommunications M-0104016 - requests to install two additional Southwestern Bell lines at the Automotive Service Center and three at the J.P. Court Precinct 7. This is to add capacity to each site for call traffic. Installation: $218.55; monthly service increase $205. Recommended.

Sheriff M-0104015 - requests to install two data-line cables to provide access to County network. Installation: $175; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Data Services M-0104014 - requests to install a data-line cable on the 5th floor to provide access to network. Installation: $41.37; no monthly service increase. Recommended.
Personnel
M-0104013 - requests to re-program several lines in the department to appear in appropriate pick groups. Installation: $42; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

M-0104012 - requests to install a data-line cable to replace a damaged existing cable and provide network access. Installation: $41.37; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

District Attorney M-0104010 - requests to replace a single-line phone with a multi-line set for the new Trial Bureau Chief. Installation: $42; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

101st District Court M-0104009 - requests to install a data-line cable in the Court Administration Office to provide network access. Installation: $41.37; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

Funding for the above requests is available from Countywide Department 800, line item 432. Telephone Contingency.