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**FIVE SIGNATURE DOCUMENT(s) FOR CONSIDERATION**

Minister’s Letter of Appreciation

**DATE(s) TO REMEMBER**
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Linda Boles, Purchasing Analyst
SUBJECT: Annual Contract for the Floor Covering Services (Section 1: Purchase of Carpet) Bid #2000-105-399

Background/Issue
On August 29, 2000, the Commissioners Court awarded Section 1 (Purchase of Carpet) of Bid #2000-105-399 to Lees Carpets for the period of August 29, 2000 through August 28, 2001. The contract provides for the purchase of carpet (roll and carpet tiles) on an as needed basis to county departments. In accordance with contract terms and upon mutual agreement, the contract may be extended for an additional twelve month period based on the existing terms, conditions and pricing. As a result of Lees Carpets' compliance with contract specifications, the Facilities Management Department requests that the County exercise the twelve month extension option contained within Bid #2000-105-399.

Lees Carpets has agreed to extend Section 1: Purchase of Carpet of Bid #2000-105-399 in accordance with the existing terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded. (see attached).

Financial Impact
Based on payment records, Dallas County has incurred annual expenditures of approximately $195,360.00 to date for the purchase of carpet under Bid #2000-105-399.

Recommendation
In accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Bid #2000-105-399, the Purchasing and Facilities Management Departments recommend that Section 1 (Purchase of Carpet) of the Annual Contract for Floor Covering Services as awarded to Lees Carpets be extended for an additional twelve month period based on the terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded, effective August 29, 2001 through August 28, 2002 at an estimated annual cost of $200,000.00

Should the Court concur with this recommendation, a Court Order will be scheduled for the July 31, 2001 Formal Agenda.

Recommended for Approval by:

Shirley Rapp, Acting Purchasing Agent

Dan Savage, Asst. Commissioners Court Administrator
Jim Barrett, Asst. Director Fac. Mgt.
Kim March, Contract Mgr.
June 21, 2001

Linda Boles
Purchasing Analyst
Dallas County Purchasing Department
509 Main Street, Records Building
6th Floor, Room 623
Dallas, Texas 75202

Dear Linda:

On behalf of Lees Carpets I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and Dallas County for your interest in extending the Annual Carpet Contract with our company. Per your request, this letter shall serve as our intent and interest to continue the contract for an additional year.

I will be transferring to our Chicago Office by the end of this month. Your new Lees Carpets representative will be Mr. Chris Hollingsworth. Please to continue ordering your carpet as you have done in the past. The copy of the purchasing orders can be sent to:

Mr. Chris Hollingsworth
c/o Lees Carpets
4573 North O'Connor, Unit #1330
Irving, Texas 75062
Office: 972.717.2921
Fax: 972.887.9661

Thanks again for all the great business that you have provided to our company! Best wishes to you and Dallas County.

Regards,

Jon C. Deibel
Lees Carpets

cc: Chris Hollingsworth
    Todd Lomas
    GSA Desk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN-PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN-INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS AND MANAGERS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICIANS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES WORKERS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE AND CLERICAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT WORKERS (BILLED)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATOR (NON-BILLED)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABORERS (NON-BILLED)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS AND MANAGERS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICIANS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES WORKERS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE AND CLERICAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT WORKERS (BILLED)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATOR (NON-BILLED)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABORERS (NON-BILLED)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Company Name:** Burlington Industries/Lee's Carpet  
**Address:** 3930 W. Friendly Ave, Greensboro, NC 27405  
**Telephone:** 800-523-3647

**Check One:**
- Minority-Owned Firm Certification
- Women-Owned Firm Certification

**Signed by:**

**Typed Name and Title:**
Judy Tuggle/Admin, Asst. HR
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court  
FROM: Linda Boles, Purchasing Analyst  
SUBJECT: Annual Contract for the Purchase of VCT and Related Floor Covering Services Bid #2000-221-621

Background/Issue  
On August 29, 2000, the Commissioners Court awarded the aforementioned contract to J.W. Smith & Associates for the period of August 29, 2000 through August 28, 2001. The contract provides for the purchase of vinyl tile and various floor covering services on an as needed basis to county departments. In accordance with contract terms and upon mutual agreement, the contract may be extended for an additional twelve month period based on the existing terms, conditions and pricing. As a result of J.W. Smith & Associates’ compliance with contract specifications, the Facilities Management Department requests that the County exercise the twelve month extension option contained within Bid #2000-221-621.

J.W. Smith & Associates has agreed to extend Bid #2000-221-621 (Annual Contract for the Purchase of VCT and Floor Covering Services) in accordance with the existing terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded. (see attached).

Financial Impact  
Based on payment records, Dallas County has incurred annual expenditures of approximately $209,000 to date for products and services covered under Bid #2000-221-621.

Recommendation  
In accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Bid #2000-221-621, the Purchasing and Facilities Management Departments recommend that the Annual Contract for VCT and Related Floor Covering Services as awarded to J.W. Smith & Associates be extended for an additional twelve month period based on the terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded, effective August 29, 2001 through August 28, 2002 at an estimated annual cost of $215,000.00.

Should the Court concur with this recommendation, a Court Order will be scheduled for the July 31, 2001 Formal Agenda.

Recommended for Approval by:

Shirley Rapp, Acting Purchasing Agent

3: Dan Savage, Asst. Commissioners Court Administrator  
   Jim Barrett, Asst. Director Fac. Mgt.  
   Kim March, Contract Mgr.
QUOTATION/PROPOSAL

J.W. Smith & Associates
P.O. Box 2335
Garland, TX 75047

TO: Dallas County/Purchasing Dept.

QUANTITY DESCRIPTION

Contract Extension

Bid#2000-221-621

Per your letter dated May 29th, J.W. Smith & Associates agree to extend terms of current contract.

Thank You.

ABOVE PRICES GOOD FOR _____ DAYS.
PLEASE REFER TO THE ABOVE QUOTATION NUMBER WHEN PLACING YOUR ORDER.

SIGNATURE

QUOTATION/PROPOSAL
## Permanent Full-Time Employment

### MALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN-PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN-INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials and Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi-Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEMALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN-PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN-INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials and Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi-Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN-PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN-INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minority-Owned Firm Certification

- **Signature**: [Signature]
- **Typed Name and Title**: [Typed Name and Title]

### Women-Owned Firm Certification

- **Signature**: [Signature]
- **Typed Name and Title**: [Typed Name and Title]

### Non-Minority Owned Firm

- **Signature**: [Signature]
- **Typed Name and Title**: [Typed Name and Title]
July 24, 2001

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court

FROM: Shirley Rapp, Interim Purchasing Agent
       Chris Thompson, Director Communications & Central Services

SUBJECT: Rental of Pagers and Pager Service

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

The Commissioners Court awarded the Annual Contract for Rental of Pagers and Pager Service, Bid No. 97-213, on July 15, 1998 to Verizon Wireless (formerly Air Touch Paging) for the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998. The contract has been extended for three of the four extension options authorized by the contract. The fourth extension option would carry the contract through July 31, 2002.

However, Tarrant County has solicited a new contract for pager service also with Verizon Wireless. The new contract with Tarrant County, Bid No. 2001-070, is identical to the contract bid to Dallas County in 1998 with the exception of price, which is lower.

The contract with Tarrant County was initially awarded for a trial period which began May 10, 2001 and extends through September 30, 2001. At that time the contract would become a firm fixed price contract for five (5) additional twelve month periods which would extend through September 30, 2006. Tarrant County has informed the Purchasing Department that the initial period has gone very well and they fully intend to execute the first year option available under the contract. Estimated annual cost differences are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dallas County</th>
<th>Tarrant County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Pager</td>
<td>$2.88 / Mo</td>
<td>$2.75 / Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pager</td>
<td>$5.95 / Mo</td>
<td>$4.95 / Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL TOTAL</td>
<td>$52,980</td>
<td>$47,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL SAVINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other services such as state and nationwide paging and call grouping are also included for reduced rates.

Dallas County currently has 812 digital and 349 numeric pagers in service.

509 Main St. (Records Bldg.)  Dallas, Texas 75202  (214) 653-7431
6th. Floor, Room 623
FINANCIAL IMPACT

Continuation of the Dallas County contract would result in an estimated annual cost of $52,980.00. Utilizing the Tarrant County contract would result in an estimated annual cost of $47,526.00, for a reduction of $5,424.00.

LEGAL ISSUES

On April 21, 1998, the Commissioners Court approved Court Order No. 98-796 which authorized execution of an Interlocal Agreement with Tarrant County which under Section 791.025 of the Texas Local Government Code and allows Dallas County to utilize any contract solicited and awarded by Tarrant County.

RECOMMENDATION

New bid pricing received by Tarrant County under Bid 2001-070, Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services, has resulted in a lower contract cost which is available for utilization by Dallas County through the Interlocal Agreement. Utilizing the Tarrant County contract would result in a lower cost to Dallas County for continued use of the same equipment currently installed. No product changes or phone number changes would be required.

As a result, the Purchasing Department in conjunction with Communications and Central Services, recommends the utilization of the Tarrant County Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services, Bid No. 2001-070, beginning September 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002. The period beginning August 1, 2001 through August 31, 2001 would be billed at the current county contract rates under Bid No. 97-213 to allow the vendor ample time to change the billing process to reflect the new rates of the Tarrant County bid.

In the event that Tarrant County elects not to extend the contract beyond the trial period which ends September 30, 2001, the Dallas County contract would be extended for the final contract option period. However, Verizon Wireless has agreed to extend the Dallas County contract at the Tarrant County contract rates.

Should the Court concur with the recommendation, a court order will be scheduled for the next formal agenda.

/sr

Attachments: Tarrant County Contract Award
              Interlocal Agreement
April 16, 2001

Doug Bonds
Verizon Wireless Messaging
580 Decker Drive Suite 101
Irving, Texas 75062

Re: Bid No. 2001-070, Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services

Dear Doug,

It is my pleasure to inform you that Tarrant County Commissioners Court has awarded your firm Bid No. 2001-070, Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services.

This contract will expire on September 30, 2001, at which time you will have the option to renew at the same firm fixed prices for five (5) additional twelve (12) month periods if agreeable between Verizon and Tarrant County. Enclosed are copies of the Award Document. The effective date of award shall be May 10, 2001.

In accordance with the bid specifications, governmental entities located in the following Counties are authorized to utilize this contract at the same firm fixed prices, terms and conditions: Tarrant, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Johnson, Parker and Wise County. You have the option of contacting these entities to increase your sales; however, each entity is required to have an Interlocal Agreement established with Tarrant County prior to using this contract. Copies of the Award Document and bid information listing may be given to the entities if required.

If you have any questions, please call me at 817-884-2620, fax 817-212-3048 or e-mail to tjones@tarrantcounty.com.

Sincerely,

Tim Jones
Senior Buyer

Attachment
SUBJECT: Bid No. 2001-070 -- Annual Contract for PAGERS and PAGING SERVICES - Countywide

COMMISSIONERS COURT ACTION REQUESTED:

AWARD TO LOW BID MEETING SPECIFICATIONS.

It is requested that the Commissioners Court award Bid No. 2001-070, Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services, to Verizon Wireless Messaging per unit cost.

BACKGROUND:

Notice of the County's intent to bid was advertised in local newspapers, as required by State statute; shown on cable television for two (2) weeks; and posted on the Internet and at the Fort Worth Metropolitan Black Chamber of Commerce and the Fort Worth Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Thirty (30) vendors were contacted and requested to participate in this bid process. Three (3) firms picked up the specifications. Three (3) bids were received.

The low bid received from Verizon Wireless Messaging meets all specifications. The bid received from Bearcom is considered to be nonresponsive, because vendor did not return any of the bid documents, as required by the specifications.

Therefore, the recommendation is that Bid No. 2001-070, Annual Contract for Pagers and Paging Services, be awarded to Verizon Wireless Messaging per unit cost.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time. Contract is to become effective as of May 10, 2001. Expenditures for last year were approximately $35,400.00.
Bid NO. 2001-070, ANNUAL CONTRACT FOR PAGERS AND PAGING SERVICES

AWARD RECOMMENDATION - LOW BID MEETING SPECIFICATIONS: VERIZON WIRELESS MESSAGING

Price's are per month, per pager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Verizon</th>
<th>Skytel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOCAL SERVICE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIGITAL</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALPHANUMERIC</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STATEWIDE SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIGITAL</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALPHANUMERIC</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOFTWARE FOR ALPHA.</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARLIEST DELV DATE:</td>
<td>5 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>REPLACEMENT COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIGITAL</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALPHANUMERIC</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>INS. / REPLACE. COST</td>
<td>Per Mo/Deductible</td>
<td>Per Mo/Deductible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIGITAL</td>
<td>.50 / 25.00</td>
<td>3.00 / 45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALPHANUMERIC</td>
<td>.50 / 50.00</td>
<td>3.00 / 65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERCENTAGE DISCOUNT</td>
<td>Varies (see attached)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bid received from Bearcom is considered to be nonresponsive, because vendor failed to return any bid documents, as required by the specifications.
# Additional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>Quantity Discount</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>SAVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Number</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
<td>0019</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>1150600</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Mail VRS (10.24.60)</td>
<td>$ 5.95</td>
<td>3030244</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>3030220</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC 800 NO 200@.15 $1.00</td>
<td>$ 7.50</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>1150744</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Digital</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>6105</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>9020801</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Alpha</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>6106</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>9020814</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PageSaver</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>9020749</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Prompt</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>9020200</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Prompt</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>8108</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>9020301</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Retention</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Group Call #</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td>0801</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>1020806</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quicktel</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td>0010</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirSource Lite Software</td>
<td>$ 29.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirSource Pro</td>
<td>$ 69.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Dispatch NDC</td>
<td>$ 10.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voice Mail:** 10 message storage. 24 storage of each message, 60 sec incoming message length

**Page Saver:** Will resends last 5 alphanumeric messages sent to unit.

**Standard Prompt:** Generic Operator Voice instructing callers to leave message

**Custom Prompt:** Allows user to leave outgoing message

**Numeric Retention:** Stores all digital pages for 24 hours

**Master Group Call:** Allows paging of multiple pagers by one number

**Quicktel Alpha device:** Standalone hardware for sending Alphanumeric messages

**AirSource Lite:** Single user PC paging software. Basic

**AirSource Pro:** Single user PC software compatible with email programs.

**Alpha Dispatch:** Operator assisted call that sends verbal message directly to Alpha Pager
Cost analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Current Verizon List Base Pricing</th>
<th>Tarrant County Discount Pricing</th>
<th>% off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numeric 1-way Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$9.95</td>
<td>Numeric 1-way Local</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric 1-way Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>$11.95</td>
<td>Numeric 1-way Statewide</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphanumeric 1-way Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$14.95</td>
<td>Alphanumeric 1-way Local</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphanumeric 1-way Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>$16.95</td>
<td>Alphanumeric 1-way Statewide</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T900 Local Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td>T900 Local</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T900 Nationwide Nationwide</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td>T900 Nationwide</td>
<td>$24.95</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Alpha Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$34.95</td>
<td>2-Way Alpha Local</td>
<td>$24.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Alpha Nationwide</td>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>$42.95</td>
<td>2-Way Alpha Nationwide</td>
<td>$33.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All pricing includes unlimited call counts except for advanced messaging
Advanced Messaging Packets 1 packet = 100 character call

Message Services
ORDER NO. 98-796
DATE APR 21 1998

STATE OF TEXAS )
COUNTY OF DALLAS )

BE IT REMEMBERED at a regular meeting of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County, Texas, held on the 21st day of April, 1998, on a motion made by Mike Cantrell, Commissioner of District No. 2, and seconded by John Wiley Price, Commissioner of District No. 3, the following order was adopted:

WHEREAS, Dallas County and Tarrant County request to enter into Interlocal/Cooperative Purchasing Agreements for use of various contracts as solicited and awarded by the respective County entities in accordance with the attached Interlocal/Cooperative County Purchasing Agreements; and

WHEREAS, Article 791.025 of the Texas Government Code permits agreements between local governments for the purchase of goods and services and satisfies the requirement of local governments to seek competitive bids for the purchase of such goods and services; now

THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorize the attached Interlocal/Cooperative Purchasing Agreements between Dallas and Tarrant County for the use of various contracts as solicited and awarded by the respective County entities and authorize the County Judge to execute the respective Interlocal/Cooperative Agreements between Dallas and Tarrant County.

DONE IN OPEN COURT, this the 21st day of April, 1998.

Lee F. Jackson, County Judge
Jim Jackson, Dist. #1
Mike Cantrell, Dist. #2
John Wiley Price, Dist. #3
Kenneth A. Mayfield, Dist. #4

Recommended By: Franklin Ybarbo, Purchasing Agent/1b
STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF TARRANT

INTERLOCAL/COOPERATIVE PURCHASING AGREEMENT
BETWEEN DALLAS COUNTY AND TARRANT COUNTY
FOR DALLAS COUNTY’S USE OF VARIOUS TARRANT COUNTY CONTRACTS

WHEREAS, the County of Tarrant, hereinafter called “TARRANT COUNTY” will enter into competitive bids for acquisition of various commodities in accordance with Local Government Code 262.023 “Competitive Bidding and Competitive Proposal Requirements”; and

WHEREAS, DALLAS COUNTY has requested that TARRANT COUNTY allow DALLAS COUNTY to enter into an agreement to permit DALLAS COUNTY to utilize and/or be incorporated into various TARRANT COUNTY contracts as solicited by TARRANT COUNTY and awarded in accordance with Local Government Purchasing Laws; and

WHEREAS, Section 791.025 of the Texas Government Code permits agreements between local governments for the purchase of goods and services and satisfies the requirement of local governments to seek competitive bids for the purchase of such goods and services.

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS AGREEMENT is hereby made and entered into by TARRANT COUNTY and DALLAS COUNTY upon and for the mutual consideration stated herein:

WITNESSETH

DALLAS COUNTY Use of TARRANT COUNTY Contracts

I.

DALLAS COUNTY and TARRANT COUNTY contract and agree that DALLAS COUNTY, upon written request to TARRANT COUNTY and upon mutual agreement with TARRANT COUNTY’S contracted vendor(s), may utilize and/or be incorporated into specified TARRANT COUNTY contracts for the purchase of various commodities and/or services as solicited by TARRANT COUNTY and awarded in accordance with Local Government Code Provisions governing County Procurement procedures (Section 262.023).

II.

DALLAS COUNTY agrees to work with and provide information to TARRANT COUNTY when seeking solicitations based on a “Cooperative County” contract.
III.

DALLAS COUNTY understands and agrees to be bound by the terms, conditions and expiration date of the requested contract and hereby agrees to fulfill each and every requirement contained therein as if DALLAS COUNTY was the original procuring agency. TARRANT COUNTY reserves the right to terminate the specified contract prior to its expiration date under the terms and conditions of the contract and County procurement policy.

IV.

For all goods and services purchased by DALLAS COUNTY, DALLAS COUNTY agrees, at its sole cost and expense, to independently administer the contract and to pay vendor directly, paying for such goods and services from current revenues, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract and bid specifications.

V.

The term of this Interlocal/Cooperative Purchasing Agreement shall commence on the date of execution by the last party to sign. This agreement shall remain in effect until written formal termination is made by either party.

VI.

DALLAS COUNTY and TARRANT COUNTY agree that in the event of a dispute between TARRANT COUNTY’S vendor and DALLAS COUNTY, or claim filed by vendor, resulting from goods or services furnished to DALLAS COUNTY by vendor that DALLAS COUNTY will notify TARRANT COUNTY of such event. DALLAS COUNTY agrees to resolve such dispute by negotiations, if possible. DALLAS COUNTY further agrees that in the event of any mediation, arbitration, litigation or other action resulting from DALLAS COUNTY’S procurement of items/services procured from the contract’s specified vendor that DALLAS COUNTY will, at its sole cost and expense, enter and defend such action, including the interest of TARRANT COUNTY, and shall pay all costs and expenses, including attorneys fees, claims, demands or judgments arising out of the utilization of the Contract by DALLAS COUNTY. DALLAS COUNTY agrees that DALLAS COUNTY will pay to TARRANT COUNTY all direct and indirect costs, including attorneys fees, associated with TARRANT COUNTY actions required for resolution of such event.

VII.

DALLAS COUNTY and TARRANT COUNTY agree and acknowledge that each entity is not an agent of the other entity and that each entity is responsible for its own acts, forbearance, negligence and deeds, and for those of its agents or employees in conjunction with the utilization and/or cooperative solicitation of specified single and annual contracts issued by TARRANT COUNTY and obtained in accordance with the Local Government Code except as hereinafter provided.

VIII.

TARRANT COUNTY and DALLAS COUNTY agree that no TARRANT County funds, equipment or personnel will be utilized in the acquisition of goods or services by DALLAS COUNTY.
IX.

BINDING AGREEMENT: AUTHORITY: PARTIES BOUND This Agreement has been duly executed and delivered by both parties and constitutes a legal, valid and binding obligation of the parties. That each person executing this agreement on behalf of each party represents and warrants that they have full right and authority to enter into this agreement.

AMENDMENT This Agreement may not be amended except in a written instrument specifically referring to this Agreement and signed by the parties hereto.

APPLICABLE LAW This agreement shall be expressly subject to TARRANT COUNTY and DALLAS COUNTY'S Sovereign Immunity, Title 5 of the TEXAS CIVIL PRACTICES AND REMEDIES CODE and all applicable federal and state law. This agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas and venue of any legal action filed by either TARRANT COUNTY or DALLAS COUNTY shall be in TARRANT County, Texas.

SEVERABILITY In the event that one or more of the provisions contained in the Agreement shall for any reason be held to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability of the Agreement shall be construed as if such invalid, illegal or unenforceable provision has never been contained herein, but shall not affect the remaining provisions of this Agreement, which shall remain in force and effect.

The County of Tarrant, Texas, has executed this agreement pursuant to Commissioners Court Order No. 78225, passed on the 7th day of April, 1998.

The County of Dallas, Texas, has executed this agreement pursuant to Commissioners Court Order No. 98-796, passed on the 21st day of April, 1998.

COUNTY OF DALLAS

BY: Lee F. Jackson
   County Judge

TARRANT COUNTY

BY: Tom Vandergriff
   County Judge

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

John Dahill
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Civil Section

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Ray Rice
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
July 24, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

From: Abbas A. Kaka P.E., Assistant Director

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

Subject: Parking Garage Structural problems – George Allen Court Building

BACKGROUND:
In April 2001 an expansion joint failure was noticed and appeared to have started at underground parking garage of George Allen Courts building. This crack seemed to travel down to the 4th level below in the garage. This concern warranted that more detail investigation is done into this problem from getting to a dangerous level and to protect structural integrity of this parking structure built in 1974.

In accordance with the recently awarded contract for an ‘Indefinite Delivery Contract’ to Vidaud + Associates, dated July 25, 2000, we had requested that they provide a proposal fee for the investigation of this structural concern. They have provided an acceptable proposal dated June 9, 2001.

IMPACT/OPERATIONS:
This project will investigate the structural damage and provide possible options and solutions.

LEGAL: This contract will be awarded in accordance with all legal requirements.

M/WBE INFORMATION: Vidaud Associates is a minority firm.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The proposed fee for the services is not to exceed $2,541.00 for this study and a report. Funds for this project will be from the FY 2001 Permanent Improvements (126.2001).

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve Work Order No. 6 to be issued to Vidaud + Associates, Inc. for their fees in the amount not to exceed $2,541.00 and the County Judge be authorized to execute the appropriate contract documents.

Approved:

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
June 9, 2001

Abbas Kaka
Project Manager
Dallas County Engineering & Project Management
George L. Allen, Sr. Courts Building, 9th Floor
600 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75202

Investigation Services for George Allen Building Parking Structure Level 1 & 4

Dear Mr. Kaka:

Vidaud + Associates Incorporated is pleased to have this opportunity to serve Dallas County and offer the following proposal for your consideration.

SCOPE OF PROJECT

We understand the scope of the project to be a due diligence review of portions of Levels 1 and 4 of the underground concrete parking structure at the George Allen Building in Dallas, Texas. We understand observations to be limited to the concrete basement wall and Level 3 slab on the south side of Level 4, and the primary concrete transfer beam and ceiling slab at the south side of Level 1 adjacent to the parking garage exit.

SERVICES

We have arranged for Jaster-Quintanilla Dallas, LLP to perform as our structural subconsultant for this project. Services will include the following:

1. Observation of the structural condition of the concrete basement wall and Level 3 slab on the south side of Level 4, and the primary concrete transfer beam and slab at the south side of Level 1 adjacent to the parking garage exit. The observation will be to the extent that the frame is not covered by finishes.

2. Review of available structural drawings for the portion of the garage identified above.

3. Preparation of opinions of probable cost for the repair of the noted deficiencies. These opinions are for budgeting purposes only. Detailed cost estimates, which require the preparation of repair documents and contractor input, are beyond the scope of this proposal. Actual bids may vary greatly from the budget numbers provided.

Services excluded from the scope of work include the following:

1. Destructive or non-destructive testing of the structural elements under review.

2. Removal of existing building finishes to observe the structural framing.
Abbas Kaka  
Dallas County Engineering & Project Management  
June 9, 2001  
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3. Field measurements for the preparation of measured drawings of the existing construction.

4. Development of repair documents to correct observed structural deficiencies.

5. Detailed cost estimates for repairs.

6. Calculations or analysis to determine structural adequacy of the structural members or compliance with the current building code.

DELIVERABLES

Two copies of the final report will be provided to the County. This report will include a photographic record of existing structural deficiencies, a written narrative of findings, a written description of potential repair strategies and budgetary opinions of probable cost to carry out those strategies.

FEES

As shown on attached proposal cost summary.

SCHEDULE

Study to be completed 45 calendar days after written Notice to Proceed is received in our office.

Sincerely,

Timothy D. Strucely, AIA  
Project Manager  
Vidaud + Associates, Inc.

Attach: Proposal Cost Summaries

cc: Russell Himes, David Rose
PROPOSAL COST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF PROJECT</th>
<th>VIDAUD + ASSOCIATES INC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Allen Parking Structure Investigation</td>
<td>13649 MONTFORT DRIVE. SUITE 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Engineering &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>DALLAS, TEXAS 75240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC SERVICES DIRECT LABOR (DL)</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATES $</th>
<th>COST $</th>
<th>TOTAL LABOR $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Writer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Construction Inspector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec &amp; Drawing Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Draftsman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD Draftsman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Technician</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Word Processor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL HOURS | 5 |
| TOTAL LABOR $ | 500.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT PROJECT EXPENSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing (review sets, presentations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax Transmissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Distance Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography (prior to Construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography (during Construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Shipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Materials (vignettes, presentations, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDLR Review Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Reimbursables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NON-BASIC SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL LABOR COST (Sum of 1 and 3) (does not include expenses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL COST INCLUDING EXPENSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,541.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGNATURE OF PREPARER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Jul-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TITLE OF PROJECT
Seventh Floor Expansion to the Sixth Floor Museum

#### DRAWING TITLE OR TASK
- Architectural Engineering

#### SCHEMATIC DESIGN
- Design
- Site Visits
- Review of Schematic Package
- Coordination of Consultants
- Design Review Meeting

#### DESIGN DEVELOPMENT
- Project Administration
- Site Visits
- Coordination of Consultants
- Site Review Meetings

#### CONTRACT DOCUMENTS
- Project Administration
- Site Visits
- Coordination of Consultants
- Site Review Meetings

#### BIDDING PHASE
- Project Administration
- Analysis of Alternates/Substitutions
- Bid Evaluation

#### CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
- Project Administration
- Observation Services
- Supplemental Documentation
- Delays Requests/Change Orders
- Project Closeout

#### POST CONTRACT SERVICES
- Record Drawing Services

#### PAGE TOTAL
- Total Hours: 224
July 24, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

From: Abbas A. Kaka P.E., Assistant Director

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

Subject: Structural problems – Juvenile Detention Facility, 4711 Harry Hines, Dallas, TX.

BACKGROUND:
In April 2001 a request from facilities Maintenance to check into possible structural problems led to further investigation into the large wall cracks showing up at ground floor. This may be due to erosion at building footing. It was noted that for several years heavy rains and flooding problems in the basement level may have damaged and eroded the beam and pier construction. The facility was built around 1949. The new addition was built attached on the eastside of the facility in 1979. All investigative work will be related to the old building structure.
Scope of work will include structural condition assessment of the foundation concrete in the crawl space. Also assessment will be done of the superstructure, load bearing masonry walls, roof structure, etc.
In accordance with the recently awarded contract for an ‘Indefinite Delivery Contract’ to Vidaud + Associates, we had requested that they provide a proposal fee for the investigation of below floor structural damage at 4711 Harry Hines facility. They have provided an acceptable proposal dated July 9, 2001.

IMPACT/OPERATIONS: This project will investigate the structural failure and provide possible options and solutions.

LEGAL: This contract will be awarded in accordance with all legal requirements.

M/WBE INFORMATION: Vidaud Associates is a minority firm.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The proposed fee for the services is not to exceed $21,343.00 for this study and report. Funds for this project will be from the FY 2001 Permanent Improvements (126.2001).

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve Work Order No. 7 to be issued to Vidaud + Associates, Inc. for the fees in the amount of not to exceed $21,343.00 and the County Judge be authorized to execute the appropriate contract documents.

Approved:

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
July 9, 2001

Abbas Kaka
Project Manager
Dallas County Engineering & Project Management
George L. Allen, Sr. Courts Building, 9th Floor
600 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75202

Juvenile Detention Center Structural Investigation

Dear Mr. Kaka:

Vidaud + Associates Incorporated is pleased to have this opportunity to serve Dallas County and offer the following proposal for your consideration.

SCOPE OF PROJECT

We understand the scope of the project to be as described below:

1. Structural condition assessment of the foundation level concrete structure. We estimate the area of investigation to be approximately 20,000 square feet consisting primarily of crawl space.

2. Assessment of structural framing of the superstructure including intermediate and roof levels, and primary load bearing masonry walls.

3. Preparation of CAD key plans for use in locating and describing conditions.

SERVICES

We have arranged for Jaster–Quintanilla Dallas, LLP to perform as our structural subconsultant for this project. Services will include the following:

1. A limited review of the existing structural plans and specifications made available by the Owner.

2. Site visits include up to four trips by the structural subconsultant and two trips by our architect.

3. Establishment of geotechnical testing to be performed by a testing agency, and review of the results of this testing. Services of a testing agency may be obtained by the client or may be included as part of the engineering services described in this proposal at the Owner’s option. Geotech services obtained through our firm will be for actual cost not-to-exceed $6,000.00, without prior written approval from the County.

4. Field measurement of the existing facility for the purpose of preparing floor plans with only enough detail to serve as key plans. The amount of $3,008.00 is included in the proposal for this task and will be treated as an amount not-to-exceed, without prior written approval from the County.
5. Preparation of opinions of probable cost for the repair of the noted structural deficiencies. These estimates are for budgeting purposes only. Detailed cost estimates, which require the preparation of repair documents and contractor input, are beyond the scope of this proposal.

Services excluded from the scope of work include the following:

1. Destructive or non-destructive testing of the structural frame
2. Removal of existing building finishes to observe the structural framing.
3. Development of repair documents to correct observed structural deficiencies
4. Detailed cost estimates for repairs.

DELIVERABLES

Two copies of the final report will be provided to the County. This report will include a photographic record of significant structural deficiencies, a written narrative of findings and their impact, a written description of recommended repair strategies and budgetary opinions of probable cost to carry out those strategies. Secondary deliverables will include a copy of all geotechnical test results and a digital copy of all key plans produced.

OWNER-FURNISHED INFORMATION

As-built documentation of the existing facility

FEES

As shown in attached proposal cost summaries.

SCHEDULE

Services to be completed 60 calendar days after written Notice to Proceed is received in our office.

It is our opinion that until the structure can be analyzed, it is difficult if not impossible to determine the level of effort required to produce repair documents. It is our opinion that it will be more cost effective for the County to have the results of the study prior to requesting design services to produce repair documents.

Sincerely,

Timothy D. Strucely, AIA
Project Manager
Vidaud + Associates, Inc.

Attach: Proposal Cost Summaries

cc: Russell Himes, David Rose
# Proposal Cost Summary

**Vidaud + Associates Inc.**  
13649 Montfort Drive, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
972/934-8888

**Title of Project:**  
Juvenile Detention Center Struct. Invest.  
Dallas County Engineering & Project Management

## 1. Basic Services Direct Labor (DL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rates ($)</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>1,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Writer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Construction Inspector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec &amp; Drawing Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Draftsman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD Draftsman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>1,248.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Technician</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Word Processor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours:** 59  
**Total Labor:** 4,508.00

## 1. Total Basic Services  
**15,008.00**

## 2. Total Expenses

### Direct Project Expenses
- Printing (review sets, presentations): 150.00
- Fax Transmissions: 0.00
- Long Distance Telephone: 0.00
- Mileage: 75.00
- Delivery: 60.00
- Photography (prior to construction): 50.00
- Photography (during construction): 0.00
- Postage/Shipping: 0.00
- Presentation Materials (vignettes, presentations, etc.): 0.00
- Other: 0.00
- TDLR Review Fee: 0.00

**335.00**

### Non-Basic Services
- Geo-Technical Testing Agency (Not to Exceed Amount): 6,000.00

**6,000.00**

## 3. Total Non-Basic Services

**6,000.00**

## 4. Total Labor Cost (Sum of 1 and 3) (Does not include expenses)

**21,008.00**

## 5. Total Cost Including Expenses

**21,343.00**

**Date:** 9-Jul-01  
**Signature of Preparer:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAWING TITLE OR TASK</th>
<th>Principal Manage</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Estimator</th>
<th>Spec Writer</th>
<th>Field Inspectors</th>
<th>Revise Drawings</th>
<th>Review Designs</th>
<th>Eng Set Drafting</th>
<th>Drafting</th>
<th>Project Coordination</th>
<th>Prod Coord.</th>
<th>Secur</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEMATIC DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Facility Survey</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours:** 59
DATE: July 18, 2001

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: Rick Loessberg, Director of Planning & Development

FROM: Rachel Brown, Community Development Assistant

SUBJECT: Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) Funding

BACKGROUND

Because of its participation in the CDBG program, Dallas County will begin receiving funding from HUD’s Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) Program for the first time on October 1. ESG is designed to prevent homelessness as well as be the first step in a continuum of assistance to enable homeless individuals and families to move toward independent living. ESG funds are awarded to states, metropolitan cities, urban counties, and territories according to the formula used by HUD for the CDBG program. Under this formula, the County will be receiving $77,000 in ESG assistance for FY2001. So that the County can decide how to utilize this funding, the following information has been prepared.

ELIGIBLE ESG ACTIVITIES

A person is considered to be homeless under the ESG program if the individual:

(1) Resides within a place not meant for human habitation (i.e., a car, sidewalk, etc.);

(2) Resides within an emergency shelter;

(3) Resides within transitional housing for homeless persons who originally came from emergency shelters or places not meant for human habitation;

(4) Is being evicted within a week from a private dwelling unit, has no subsequent residence identified and lacks the resources and the support networks to needed to obtain housing;

(5) Is being discharged within a week from an institution in which the person has been a resident for more than thirty consecutive days, has no subsequent residence identified, and lacks the resources and the support networks to needed to obtain housing; or
(6) Is fleeing a domestic violence situation, has no subsequent residence identified, and lacks the resources and the support networks to needed to obtain housing.

ESG funds may be used for one or more of the following homeless-related activities:

(1) Renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion of buildings for use as emergency shelters;

(2) Provision of essential services for the homeless, which includes services concerned with employment, health, drug abuse, education, housing, transportation, child care, and obtaining other federal, state, or local assistance/benefits;

(3) Shelter operating costs, such as maintenance, insurance, utilities, rent, and furnishings; and

(4) Homeless prevention efforts, which include short-term subsides to defray delinquent rent and utility charges for families that have received eviction or utility termination notices, security deposits or first month’s rent to permit a homeless family to move into its own apartment, mediation programs for landlord-tenant disputes, legal services programs for the representation of indigent tenants in eviction proceedings, and payments to prevent foreclosure on a home.

In the event ESG funds are used for homeless prevention activities, ESG assistance can only complement and not supplant funding from pre-existing sources. Other significant ESG rules include limiting the funding of shelter staff to no more than 10% of the County’s total ESG award, limiting the funding of homeless prevention efforts to no more than 30% of the County’s award, and limiting the funding of essential services to no more than 30% of the County’s award.

**IMPACT ON OPERATIONS**

There are four policy issues related to ESG that must be resolved in order for the County to be able to allocate its ESG award. The first of these issues deals with where the funds should be geographically located/who should be eligible to receive them. The County is receiving ESG assistance because of its participation in the CDBG program which it operates in fourteen cities. However, the vast majority of the County’s homeless population is not located within this fourteen-city CDBG service area; it is located within the City of Dallas which also directly receives ESG funding from HUD. Similarly, almost all of the homeless service providers in the County are located within Dallas; staff is only aware of a few organizations that are physically located within the County’s CDBG area.

Staff has discussed this issue with HUD who has said that the County does not have to limit the provision of ESG assistance to individuals and entities within its fourteen-city CDBG area. Instead,
ESG assistance can be provided to any eligible entity or individual within the entire County if it is so desired.

Given that no significant homeless population seems to exist within the fourteen-city CDBG area (a staff survey conducted in May 2000 was unable to detect any homeless individuals) and given that when the fourteen cities do encounter homeless individuals within their jurisdictions, they typically refer them to Dallas-located agencies, staff would propose that the County not limit the use of its ESG assistance to people or entities located within the fourteen-city CDBG area.

The second policy-related issue that needs to be determined is whether the County should directly retain any of the ESG funding for activities that it (rather than another entity) would conduct. While it is not possible to simply combine all of the County’s ESG award with the County’s existing homeless prevention programs because of the federal regulations that prohibit supplanting and that limit homeless prevention funding to 30% of a total award, the County’s Health & Human Services Department has indicated that it would like to be able to utilize $46,200 of the County’s $77,000 ESG award so that it could serve a new group of individuals (ex-offenders) that are at-risk of being homeless and that are not currently eligible for assistance under the County’s welfare policy. $23,100 of this $46,200 would be used for homeless prevention assistance, and the other $23,100 would be used to provide essential social services for this group. Both programs would be administered by Health & Human Services using existing staff and would have their proposed eligibility criteria and policies briefed by Health & Human Services at a later date before becoming operational.

Since federal regulations, in effect, require that at least 40% of the County’s ESG award be spent on such activities as establishing and operating shelters which the County does not directly do, at least $30,800 of the County’s award will have to be allocated to outside entities (i.e., nonprofit organizations). As a result, the final ESG-related policy issues that need to be resolved deal with determining what process should be used to allocate this assistance and whether the County wishes to consider proposals for any eligible ESG activity or just those within a specifically defined category.

In the past, the County has used a request for proposal process to allocate social service grant funding, and staff would propose that such a process be again used. It is further proposed that submitted proposals be evaluated by a committee consisting of a representative from the County’s CDBG program, the Budget Office, Purchasing, Planning & Development, Health & Human Services, and the M/WBE program and that the proposals be evaluated using the following 100-point scoring criteria (which is similar to what has been used for other County housing and social service grant funds):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Beneficiaries</th>
<th>20 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Need/Existence</td>
<td>35 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Under-Served Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity/Experience</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/WBE Participation</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rather than accepting proposals for any eligible ESG activity, it is also proposed that the County only consider proposals that seek funding for an entity’s operating utilities. This was done on two State-provided ESG awards that the County received on behalf of several non-profits in the 1990s, and this arrangement worked well for the State, the County, and the non-profits in that it simplified compliance monitoring while still providing valuable financial assistance. Staff has discussed some of the mechanics of designing a County-administered ESG program with the Texas Department of Housing & Community Affairs (which administers the ESG program for the State), and TDHCA has also suggested limiting proposals to a specific project type given the relatively small amount of funds ($30,800) that the County will have available.

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

The time frame for the use of the $77,000 in ESG funds is as follows:

- **July 25-September 30**: Health & Human Services develops policies and procedures for its new homeless programs; briefs Court
- **July 27-August 20**: Application cycle for non-profits
- **September 4**: Brief Court on funding recommendations for non-profits
- **September 11**: Court order non-profit funding awards
- **October 1**: Funding becomes available for non-profits and Health & Human Services and must be spent within twenty-four months

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the County’s ESG assistance be used for activities that can be conducted anywhere within the County, that $46,200 of the County’s ESG award be utilized by Health & Human Services for new homeless programs that would serve ex-offenders, that the remaining $30,800 in ESG assistance be used to fund operating utilities for non-profit homeless service providers, and that the $30,800 be allocated to these non-profits on the basis of competitively evaluated proposals.

Recommended by:

J. Allen Clemson, Administrator
cc:  Ryan Brown, Budget Office  
     Virginia Porter, County Auditor  
     Betty Culbreath-Lister, Health & Human Services Director  
     CDBG staff
July 18, 2001

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: J. Allen Clemson, Administrator

FROM: Rick Loessberg, Director of Planning & Development

SUBJECT: Request to Change Effective Date of Tax Abatement for Phase II of Jefferson at Bryan Place Housing Development

BACKGROUND

The County has recently received a request from JPI Texas Development to change the effective date of the tax abatement for Phase II of its Jefferson at Bryan Place housing development from January 1, 2003 to January 1, 2005. As this request was not consistent with the County’s tax abatement policy, this item was not originally placed on the Court’s briefing agenda. However, because of the potential economic impact of this project, Commissioner Price has asked that this request be briefed.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Located immediately east of downtown, JPI’s Phase II development will involve the construction of 250 housing units of which 20% will be affordable to people earning less than 80% of the Dallas area median income. It also represents the fifth multi-family housing development that JPI will have constructed in and around downtown since the mid-1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>TAX BASE INCREASE</th>
<th># OF UNITS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaston Yards</td>
<td>$32.6 million</td>
<td>400+ units</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>$42.2 million</td>
<td>500+ units</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Place, Phase I</td>
<td>$25 million</td>
<td>380+ units</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessler Heights</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>338 units</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bryan Place, Phase II</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>250 units</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pending</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To date, JPI has constructed 1440 housing units in the downtown area, with 20% of them being affordable, at a total investment of approximately $130 million; it also has another 338 units, with an expected investment of about $25 million, under construction at its Kessler Heights development in Oak Cliff, and it has plans for a second $25 million phase at this development as well.

In January 1999, the Commissioners Court formally authorized the provision of an 85% County/Hospital District tax abatement for Phase II of Jefferson at Bryan Place, provided that, by January 1, 2001, 250 units of housing had been built (of which 20% had to be affordable) and that the County’s tax base had been increased by at least $20 million. In August 1999, the effective date of this abatement was changed, at the request of JPI, from January 1, 2001 to January 1, 2003; this request was made due to a change in market conditions. Several months ago, JPI requested that the effective date be again changed—to January 1, 2005—because the unfavorable market conditions had continued.

**IMPACT ON OPERATIONS**

When the County first authorized an abatement for JPI’s Phase II project, the County’s abatement policy required that all eligible abatement projects had to meet their various required investment/housing production/job generation levels “within three years.” However, while the policy did not define within three years of what date, it was generally interpreted to mean within three years of when an abatement was approved. This interpretation was formally incorporated into the County’s abatement policy when the current policy was adopted in 2000.

Since the adoption of the County’s first abatement policy in 1988, the County has provided almost fifty abatements. Of these previous abatements, the effective dates of seven of them have been changed. All but one of the projects involved producing housing and/or utilizing an historic building, and all of the changes were requested because it had taken longer than originally expected to arrange financing, to resolve other issues with the city, or to convert the building into housing.

As seen below, the granted extensions ranged from providing an additional twelve to thirty months and resulted in giving no project more than 42 months before its abatement went into effect. In comparison, JPI has already previously been granted an extension of 24 months which allows its Phase II project to have 48 months before its abatement goes into effect. With the additional 24-month request that is now being made, the effective date for this project would be delayed by a total of 48 months, thus giving the project a total of 72 months from when the abatement was first approved to when it would go into effect.
There are various policy implications associated with JPI’s request. Authorizing an additional delay could help ensure that this $20 million project, which will also create affordable housing, will occur. Should this project occur, it could help continue a trend in downtown reinvestment that began several years ago.

However, if the requested extension is provided and JPI is still unable to complete the project because of unfavorable market conditions, then JPI may request yet an additional extension. Also, if an extension beyond the standard three-year time-frame is provided to a housing development because of unfavorable market conditions, then a widget-manufacturer that has previously obtained an abatement for a new widget plant may also ask the County for an extension when the market for his product softens.

There is also a question of how long is too long to wait for a project to materialize. It is possible that if a project is given more than three years to materialize, then the need to provide an incentive for the activity may no longer exist—the market may have changed to such an extent that the activity would have occurred anyway. For projects involving relatively unproven developments like in-town housing, this could especially be the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF EXTENSION</th>
<th>TOTAL PERIOD FROM APPROVAL TO EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southside on Lamar</td>
<td>21 months</td>
<td>34 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Building</td>
<td>30 months</td>
<td>42 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe II</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800 Commerce</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>30 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture Beauty</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>33 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>28 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessler Heights</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II, Bryan Place</td>
<td>48 months (total requested)</td>
<td>72 months (total requested)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMOUNT OF TOTAL PERIOD FROM PROJECT EXTENSION APPROVAL TO EFFECTIVE DATE
POSSIBLE OPTIONS

Numerous options for addressing JPI’s request exist. These include:

1. Letting the current effective date and terms remain in place;

2. Maintaining the current effective date, but reducing the number of units and the amount of tax base increase that must be in place by January 1, 2003 to a number that is still consistent with policy and that will still provide JPI with an opportunity to be eligible for the abatement;

3. Granting an exception to policy with the understanding that no additional extensions will be provided;

4. Rescinding the original abatement, then authorizing a new abatement that will have the requested effective date of January 1, 2005; or

5. Revising the current abatement policy by either:

   a. Eliminating the requirement that a project must meet the policy’s job generation/investment/housing production requirements within a specific amount of time;

   b. Increasing the amount of time provided to housing and historic preservation projects from three years to six years;

   c. Increasing the amount of time provided to all types of abatement projects from three years to six years.

Of these various options, letting the current effective date and terms remain in place is the most straightforward and has the least policy implications. However, it is not clear what will happen to Phase II should it not qualify for the County/Hospital District abatement.

Of the other remaining options, maintaining the current effective date, but reducing the number of units and the amount of tax base increase that must be in place by January 1, 2003, as well as rescinding the original abatement and providing a new one, would appear to be the most advantageous in that they continue to help facilitate the Phase II project without having to waive or amend existing policy. As mentioned previously, JPI is currently required to have 250 units of housing and a $20 million increase in tax base by January 1, 2003. Since it will take approximately eighteen months to fully complete the project and since the soonest that JPI will be able to start construction is later this year, it will not be possible for JPI to meet the current housing production/tax base increase requirements by January 2003. However, since the County’s abatement
policy allows abatements for housing projects as long as at least thirty housing units and a tax base increase of $1.5 million are generated, it should be possible for JPI to have enough of Phase II completed by January 1, 2003 in order to meet the abatement policy’s minimum requirements. JPI would then be required to fully meet the current 250-unit/$20-million terms one or two years later. Staff and JPI have discussed this option in the past, and there now appears to be more interest in exploring this possibility further.

Because the City of Dallas and JPI have not fully executed the abatement agreement for this project, it is also possible under State law for the County to rescind the original abatement, authorize a new abatement, and if the County is willing to “round-up” (as was done for the Kirby Building abatement) and use 2002 as the starting point since 2001 is more than halfway completed, and start the project’s clock all over again. Since it is unusual that the abatement agreement for this project has still not been executed after so much time, this is an opportunity/situation that probably will not reoccur with great frequency.

As for granting an exception to policy with the understanding that no additional extensions will be provided, this will help ensure that the project can continue at this time. However, it does not eliminate the likelihood that other projects in the future will request extensions similar to what Phase II received.

Increasing the amount of time provided to housing and historic preservation projects would seem logical since these are generally the only types of projects that have needed extensions in the past. However, in order to have Phase II be eligible under such a provision, housing and historic preservation projects would have to be given up to six years, and this seems to be too long of a period. A period this long could also lead to an increase in abatement requests/encourage proposals for more financially speculative projects since applicants would have a much longer period in which to obtain investors and to work out other details.

As an alternative to increasing the amount of time provided to housing and historic preservation projects, the three-year requirement could be extended for all types of abatement projects or simply done away with altogether. Again, this could lead to an increase in more speculative abatement requests.

**IMPACT ON FINANCE**

With Phase II expected to increase the County’s tax base by at least $20 million, the previously approved 85% tax abatement would result in the County abating about $33,300 a year in revenue that does not currently exist while collecting about $5900 in new revenue. The same 85% abatement would similarly result in the Hospital District abating approximately $43,200 a year and collecting an additional $7600 a year. The Phase II abatement would also result in having approximately 0.7%
of the County’s tax base be abated in either 2003 or 2005; such a figure is unchanged from what is currently in effect.

**LEGAL INFORMATION**

In accordance with State law, the County’s existing policy can only be waived or amended with a three-fourths majority vote. However, maintaining the current effective date while reducing the number of housing units and the amount of tax base increase that must be present by January 1, 2003 can be done by a simple majority vote as long as at least thirty units of housing and a $1.5 million increase in the tax base are realized by that date. Similarly, rescinding the current abatement and then authorizing a new one can also be done by a simple majority vote.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Because JPI’s request to delay the effective date of the tax abatement for Phase II of its Bryan Place housing development is not consistent with the County’s abatement policy, this request is not recommended. If, however, the Court would like to be able to continue facilitating Phase II, it is recommended that this be done by either:

1. Maintaining the current effective date and reducing the original housing unit production/tax base increase requirements; or

2. Rescinding the original abatement and authorizing a new abatement rather than by granting an exception to policy.

Recommended by:

J. Allen Clemson, Administrator

cc: Ryan Brown, Acting Budget Officer  
Virginia Porter, Auditor  
David Childs, Tax Assessor/Collector  
Ron Anderson, Hospital District  
Susan Mead, Jenkens & Gilchrist
Date: July 24, 2001
To: Commissioners Court
From: Kristin Branam, Policy Analyst
Subject: Updating the Payroll policy

BACKGROUND

The Payroll section (Section B) of the Policies and Procedures Manual was updated when the new biweekly payroll system was implemented in October, 2000. Several sections concerning leave accrual were inadvertently overlooked at that time. These items translate accrual from the previous practice of accruing at a semi-monthly or monthly rate to a biweekly rate. Attached are the pages that are being changed to reflect the updated biweekly practices that have been in place since the implementation.

The sections that have changes are: 2.01, 2.10, 3.03, 3.04, 3.06, 3.07, 3.15, 3.22, 3.27.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the attached updated payroll policy pages be adopted in Section B of the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Approved by:

J. Allen Clemson, Administrator
PAYROLL ADJUSTMENTS

2.00 In order for requests for payroll adjustments to be processed, all essential paperwork must be completed and submitted to the Auditor’s office by noon two Fridays preceding the Commissioners Court meeting at which time the requests are to be approved. For example, to get an item on the Commissioners Court for Tuesday the 20th, the request must be in by Friday the 9th.

2.01 Any change of an employee’s status from part-time to full-time or exempt to non-exempt will be authorized only on the first day of the County work week pay period (Saturday).

2.02 Adding new Employees: The following forms are required to add a new employee:
   (A) The New Employee and Position Change form #6-1 (Exhibit AC) which is often referred to as the Personnel Court Order is submitted separately to County Auditor by the hiring department
   (B) Federal Withholding Allowance Certificate form #W-4 (Exhibit AD)
   (C) Texas County and District Retirement System Personal Data Form #TCDRS-2 (Exhibit AE)
   (D) Insurance Application Form (see Personnel/Civil Service Department for this form)
   (E) Employment Eligibility Verification form #I-9 (Exhibit AF)
   (F) Election Pursuant to Open Records Act (Exhibit AG)
   (G) Employer’s Notice to New Employees (Workers Compensation) (Exhibit AH)
   (H) Drug-Free Workplace Policy Acknowledgement (Exhibit AI)
   (I) Affirmative Action Plan (Exhibit AJ)
   (J) Probationary Salary Program form (Exhibit AK)
   (K) Applicant Flow (Interview Record) (Exhibit AL)
   (L) Employee Benefits Information Packet Receipt (Exhibit AM)

2.03 Salary Change: To change an employee’s salary use a New Employees and Position Change form (Exhibit AC).

2.04 Position Change with Salary Change: To change an employee’s position and salary use a New Employees and Position Change form (Exhibit AC).

2.05 Position Change within Present Department (No Salary Change): To change an employee’s position within the same department with no salary change use a New Employees and Position Change form (Exhibit AC).
Section B

DALLAS COUNTY POLICY

2.06 **Transfer from One Department to Another:** To transfer an employee from one department to another use a New Employees and Position Change form (Exhibit AC).

2.07 **Re-appointment to County Employment:** To re-appoint an employee to county employment use a New Employees and Position Change form (Exhibit AC).

2.08 **Terminations:** When an employee is terminated use a Notice of Separation form #6-5 (Exhibit BA).

2.09 **Change the Number of Federal Withholding Exemptions:** To change the number of federal withholding exemptions use the following forms:
   A) Request for Personnel Action form #6-A (Exhibit AQ), and
   B) Federal Withholding Allowance Certificate form #W-4 (Exhibit AD).

2.10 **Changes in Personnel Data Related to Payroll:** When an employee changes their address, marital status, name or social security number use a Request for Personnel Action form #6-A (Exhibit AR). These changes may be made by an authorized departmental representative through the Oracle Web Application.

[Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]

**PAYROLL OPTIONS**

2.11 Commissioners Court approved several payroll options for County employees who wish to participate.

[Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]

**PAYROLL - DIRECT DEPOSIT**

2.12 Payroll direct deposit provides County employees with the option to have their paycheck automatically deposited into their financial institution each pay period.

2.13 County employees may enroll in, withdraw from, or make changes in their participation in the County's Payroll Direct Deposit Program by contacting the County Treasurer's Office.

[Court Order 90-1473, 09/04/90]
Section B

DALLAS COUNTY POLICY

LEAVE POLICY

NOTIFICATION OF ABSENCE

3.00 Regular attendance is important to the overall operation of the department. If, for any reason, an employee is unable to report for work, notification shall be made to the employee’s immediate supervisor at the earliest time possible. Based on prior or timely notification, the department shall determine an employee’s eligibility to receive paid leave.

[Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]

GENERAL POLICIES

3.01 Effective Date of Employment shall mean the day from which an employee’s time in grade and length of service is calculated in order to accumulate leave.

3.02 Effective date of an employee’s termination will be the last actual day the employee worked for the County. Any accrued leave benefits that are eligible for payment as of the employee’s termination date will be paid on the employee’s last pay check.

3.03 For employees who commence employment on the 1st through the 15th, their effective date of employment will be the first of that month. For employees who commence employment after the 15th of the month, their effective date of employment will be the 1st of the following month. Employees’ effective date of employment for accrual purposes is the first day the employee works full-time.

3.04 Vacation and sick leave accrual will be calculated from the start of the employee’s effective date of employment: first full pay period an employee works.

3.05 Regular, Part-Time; Temporary, Full-time; and Temporary, Part-time employees do not receive paid sick leave or vacation leave benefits.

3.06 An employee must work the entire pay period, half of the working days of the month or be on paid leave of absence to accrue vacation and sick leave benefits for the pay period month.

[Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]
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SICK LEAVE

3.07 Sick leave accrues at the rate of 3.692 hours per pay period (i.e. 8 hours) per month for Regular, Full-time Dallas County employees. This is a total of 96 hours per year.

3.08 Deleted. [Court Order #99-376, 02/23/99]

3.09 Sick leave may accrue to an employee without limitation. [Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]

EXPENDING SICK LEAVE

3.10 Sick leave shall be authorized when an employee is physically incapacitated from performance of duties due to non-job related illness, injury, when such employee has notified his supervisor in a timely manner consistent with Section B 3.00 and Section A 4.21.

3.11 Sick leave shall be authorized when an employee is physically incapacitated from performance of duties due to non-job related illness, injury, maternity condition, death in an employee's immediate family, illness of a serious nature or non-emergency medical appointments in an employee's immediate family.

3.12 Immediate family members include the following:


Any person serving as parent/guardian; or any relative living in the same household.

3.13 Any periods of incapacity that result from involvement in illegal activities, the excessive use of alcohol or drugs, or use of illegal substances will not be allowable for sick leave purposes, unless the employee is under the treatment of a licensed physician or on an inpatient basis in a medically approved hospital/treatment facility.

3.14 An employee who has completed six months or more service from effective date of employment and who is sick, injured, or has a major operation may, with the approval of the employee's Department Head, borrow sick leave not to exceed six days. Upon termination (except in the case of death) a deduction for unearned sick leave will be made from the employee's check.
3.15 Sick leave shall be expended in no less than $\frac{1}{10}$ hour increments.

3.16 An employee's supervisor or Department Head may request a doctor's statement to substantiate sick leave requests.

3.17 Extensive and/or questionable use of sick leave shall be reviewed by the employee's supervisor and/or Department Head. If the finding of the review indicates misuse, disciplinary action or termination of employment may be recommended.

3.18 Permission from the employee's immediate supervisor should be obtained before an appointment for non-emergency medical, dental or optical examination is made if the appointment is scheduled during normal working hours.

[Court Orde: 1788, 10/08/91]
VACATION LEAVE

RATE OF ACCRUAL

3.22 Regular. Full-time employees of Dallas County shall be entitled to vacation leave as follows:

(A) Employees having less than 6 complete years or 72 months of continuous service from their effective date of employment, shall begin earning 6.66 hours of vacation leave per month pay period of service for a total of two weeks per twelve months, or one year, of service.

(B) Upon completion of at least 6 complete years or 72 months continuous employment, an employee shall begin earning 4.615 hours of vacation leave each month pay period of service for a total of three weeks per 12 months, or one year, of service.

(C) Upon completion of 15 years or 180 months of continuous service, an employee shall begin earning 6.154 hours of vacation leave each month pay period of service for a total of four weeks per 12 months, or one year, of service.

3.23 Employees are not required to expend all vacation leave and may accrue a maximum of two weeks vacation time in addition to their normally earned vacation time.

3.24 Holidays occurring within a vacation period are not counted as part of the vacation.

[Court Order #91-1788, 10/08/91]

EXPENDING VACATION LEAVE

3.25 Vacation leave shall only be expended with prior approval by an employee's supervisor.

3.26 Employees must complete their Employment Probationary Period before they are eligible to expend their accrued vacation.

3.27 Employees of more than six months will be eligible to expend only the amount of vacation leave they have accumulated as of the last day of the preceding month pay period that they are requesting leave; however, vacation time may be advanced to the employee for the remainder of the fiscal year, or any portion thereof, by approval of the Department Head. Should the employee leave the employment of Dallas County before earning credit for the
July 12, 2001

To: Commissioners Court

Through: Ryan Brown, Acting Budget Officer

From: Ronica L. Watkins, Budget & Policy Analyst

Subject: H.B. 177 – Technology Fund for Justice Courts

**Background**
The 77th Legislature passed H.B. 177, which authorizes commissioners court of a county to create a justice court technology fund and to require certain defendants to pay court costs for deposit in the fund to be established to finance the purchase of technological enhancements for a justice court. Establishing the technology fund for the justice courts would enable them to acquire the technology they need to upgrade their systems to operate in a more efficient manner. The bill amends Chapter 102A, Code of Criminal Procedures, by adding Article 102.0173 (attached). The purpose of this briefing is to provide a recommendation on the amendment to the Act.

**Operational Impact**
Assessing this fee will generate no additional workload for the justice clerks. However, the bookkeeper will need to identify the monies collected for the justice technology escrow. It is anticipated that SCT will have to perform some minor programming adjustments to JPAS to include a new fee type and the Auditor’s Office will need to designate an escrow account to be used only to finance the purchase of technological enhancements for the justice courts.

**Legal Impact**
The bill provides that a justice court may collect an additional fee for technology court cost of up to $4 to be authorized by the Commissioners Court. The justice court technology fund is to be administered by or under the direction of the Commissioners Court of the county. This Act applies only to a cost on conviction for an offense committed on or after September 1, 2001 and before September 1, 2005.
Financial Impact
Based on the maximum proposed rate of $4 per offense, there is a potential for a significant amount of revenue gain for Dallas County. There were approximately, 124,046 misdemeanor cases filed (excluding 20,000 truancy cases filed) in the fourteen J.P. Courts from, January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2000. Assuming an overall collection rate of at least 66% of the 124,046 cases filed (81,870), OBE projects $327,481 in additional revenue for Dallas County in FY2002 if the volume of misdemeanor cases filed in the justice courts remains constant during the next fiscal year.

Recommendation
Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that Commissioners Court authorizes the Justice of the Peace to require a defendant convicted of a misdemeanor offense in a justice court to pay a $4 fee as a court cost. The fee should become effective October 1, 2001 to correspond with the implementation of the redistricting for Dallas County. Also, the Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that SCT and the Auditor’s Office coordinate to establish a fee type and designate an escrow account solely for the justice technology fund.
AN ACT
relating to the authority of the commissioners court of a county to
create a justice court technology fund and to require certain
defendants to pay court costs for deposit in the fund.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:
SECTION 1. Subchapter A, Chapter 102, Code of Criminal
Procedure, is amended by adding Article 102.0173 to read as
follows:
(1) Art. 102.0173. COURT COSTS; JUSTICE COURT TECHNOLOGY FUND.
(a) The commissioners court of a county by order may create a
justice court technology fund and may require a defendant
convicted of a misdemeanor offense in a justice court to pay a
technology fee not to exceed $4 as a cost of court.
(b) In this article, a person is considered convicted if:
(1) a sentence is imposed on the person; or
(2) the court defers final disposition of the person.
(c) The justice court clerk shall collect the costs and pay
the funds to the county treasurer, or to any other official who
discharges the duties commonly delegated to the county treasurer,
for deposit in a fund to be known as the justice court technology
fund.
(d) A fund designated by this article may be used only to
finance the purchase of technological enhancements for a justice
court, including:
(1) computer systems;
(2) computer networks;
(3) computer hardware;
(4) computer software;
(5) imaging systems;
(6) electronic kiosks;
(7) electronic ticket writers; and
(8) docket management systems.
(e) The justice court technology fund shall be administered
by or under the direction of the commissioners court of the county.
(f) This article expires September 1, 2005.
SECTION 2. (a) This Act takes effect September 1, 2001, and
applies only to a cost on conviction for an offense committed on or
after that date and before September 1, 2005. A cost on conviction
for an offense committed before the effective date of this Act is
covered by the law in effect when the offense was committed, and
the former law is continued in effect for that purpose. A cost on
conviction for an offense committed before September 1, 2005, in
which the conviction is not entered until September 1, 2005, or
later is imposed in the same manner as if the conviction had been
entered before September 1, 2005, and notwithstanding Article
102.0173(f), Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by this Act, the
law is continued in effect for that purpose.
(b) For purposes of this section, an offense was committed
before the effective date of this Act if any element of the offense
occurred before that date, and an offense is committed on or after
September 1, 2005, if any element of the offense occurs on or after
that date.

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Chief Clerk of the House
I certify that H.B. No. 177 was passed by the House on March
29, 2001, by a non-record vote.
I certify that H.B. No. 177 was passed by the Senate on May
17, 2001, by a viva-voce vote.
July 18, 2001

To: Members of Commissioners Court

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

Subject: Request to Increase Part time Hourly Rate for Retired Employee – Public Works

Background
In December, 2000, Commissioners Court approved the creation of a temporary part time Construction Inspector position until the completion of the Miller Road Bond Fund Project. The Department made a decision not to hire another construction inspector to fill the full-time vacancy created when the senior inspector retired. Instead, they made a decision to only fill the part-time position with the senior inspector who had recently retired. They are requesting that the salary of the part-time inspector be increased to $18.43 per hour, which was his salary prior to retirement. The additional salary will be funded with the salary lag created by the decision not to fill the full-time construction inspector position.

Impact on Operations
The rehiring of the experienced retiree will allow the County to continue completion of the Miller Road Bond Fund Project of which he was the primary inspector as well as train new inspectors on road and bridge projects.

Financial Impact
The Department will continue to leave the fulltime construction inspector position vacant through the duration of this project at an annual savings of $38,771 (monthly savings of $3,231). The cost to pay the $18.43 per hour will cost approximately $20,509, for a total savings of $18,262 per year.

Recommendation
The Personnel/Civil Service Department recommends Commissioners Court approve the increase in the hourly salary rate for the temporary part time position of construction inspector, from $12.71 to $18.43 hour, for the balance of the project completion period at a projected savings of $18,262.00, to be effective July 28, 2001.

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

501 Main Street
Records Building
Dallas, Texas
Equal Opportunity Employer
214.653.7638
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From: Melody Davis
To: Urmit Graham
Date: Thu, Jun 28, 2001 3:56 PM
Subject: Request to increase Hourly Rate

Urmit:

Per our conversation and your request on Wednesday, 27-June, the Public Works Department is requesting to increase *Michael Angell's* parttime hourly rate of $12.71 to $18.43 less benefits.

Mr. Angell is an experienced construction inspector who retired in December 2000 and returned to Dallas County as a parttime employee. However, due to Mr. Angell's involvement and experience on a high profile project, this position would have been hard to fill with a knowledgeable and experienced candidate.

Therefore, we recommend that the Personnel Dept. process the 6-18-01 court order to return Mr. Angell to the hourly rate previously held prior to his parttime status.

If you have any further questions, or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you.

CC: Alberta Robinson, Donald Holzwarth
DATE: 6-26-01

SENT BY:

DALLAS COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
411 ELM STREET, 4TH FLOOR
DALLAS, TEXAS 75202
Phone: 214-653-7151
Fax: 214-653-6445

TO:

URMIT Graham
COMPENSATION

FAX NUMBER: 7608

PHONE NO.: X 6052

NO. OF PAGES (Inc. Cover Sheet): 4

COMMENTS: Call me if you have anymore questions

Please call 214-653-7151 if there are any difficulties or problems in the transmission of this fax.
December 7, 2000

TO: Commissioners Court

FROM: Donald R. Holzwarth, P.E., Director of Public Works

SUBJECT: Request for Temporary Part-time Construction Inspector position

Background of Issue
The Public Works Department is requesting permission to create a temporary part time Construction Inspector position (job code 8118000) until the completion of the Miller Road Bond Fund project. This position would be filled by the previous inspector for this Miller Road project Mike Angell who recently retired. Due to Mr. Angell’s involvement and key experience (over 30 years) he will be able to train new inspectors on road and bridge inspection as well as continue the completion of the inspection activities for this vital project.

Mr. Angell will be utilized for the completion of the Miller Road Project-Phase I. The estimated duration for this project is 18 months.

Operational Impact
From an operations and budgetary view, the process of filling this part time position will provide a departmental cost savings to the county by funding the position with the vacant full time Construction Inspector budgeted salaries and fringe benefits. The identified candidate has over 30 years of construction experience and will also provide valuable training for new inspectors.

Additionally, Public Works will not fill the vacant full time position until the completion of the Miller Road Project-Phase I and expiration of the temporary part time contract.

Recommendation
It is recommended that Commissioners Court approve the creation of a temporary part time position for the duration of the Miller Road Project-Phase I.
December 12, 2000

To: Helen Taylor  
Personnel Analyst

From: Brian Pekluda  
Budget & Policy Analyst

Subject: Temporarily Filling a Full-time Position with a Part-time Position: Construction Inspector

Public Works has requested the ability to fill a currently vacant Construction Inspector position (Job Code 3014500) with a part-time staff position for the duration of a specific project. This is estimated to take until at 18 months. From an operations and budgetary standpoint and pursuant to the policy described in Court Order 92-877, I recommend that Public Works have the ability to fill their vacancy on a part-time basis. I will ask Melody Davis of Public Works to follow up with you to ensure proper posting of the position.

If you need any additional information, please contact me at (214) 651-6655, or Melody Davis at (214) 653-6415. As always, your assistance is greatly appreciated.

CC: Melody Davis, Public Works
MISCELLANEOUS

1) **OFFICE OF BUDGET & EVALUATION** - requests:

   a) approval to transfer a total of $6,650 within the various Constable Offices. This funding will be used to order the new badges that will be needed as a result of redistricting.

   b) authorization of additional funds for the Public Health Lab in the Dallas County Health & Human Services Department for laboratory supplies in the amount of $31,000. The additional funds will primarily be used for the purchase of test kits used for gonorrhea and chlamydia tests. There has been an increase in the volume of tests being performed, in addition to more confirmatory tests being done on samples that may have previously been giving false positives. Funds are available within budget and are reimbursed through the Parkland community health services contract. Recommended.

2) **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT** - requests permission for the City of Grand Prairie to use the Commissioners Courtroom on Thursday, August 16, 2001 from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. for an eminent domain Commissioners Hearing on the City of Grand Prairie, Texas v. Westchester Corner Store, Inc., Cause #CC-01-05476-C, set in Dallas County Court at Law #3. Facilities Management will prepare the necessary paperwork.

3) **DISTRICT COURT ADMINISTRATION** - requests authorization for reduced parking cost at the juror rate of $3/day at the George L. Allen, Sr. Courts Building, Underground Parking Garage for the four (4) 192nd District Court’s summer law clerks. (Please refer to Information Item #4)
TRAVEL REQUESTS

4) HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - requests:


d) Thomas Davis - Speak at the “Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities” meeting - Little Rock, AK - August 28, 2001 at no cost to Dallas County.

e) Rita Moss - American Psychiatric Association 53rd Institute on Psychiatric Services - Orlando, FL - October 9-15, 2001 at no cost to Dallas County.

5) PROBATE COURT #3 (LOVING) - Judge Loving and Deborah Foster - Texas College of Probate Judges Annual Conference - San Antonio, TX - September 5-8, 2001: $876 and $889 from Probate Court Education Escrow Account 00120.4703.21667.2001.

MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT

(1) DEPARTMENT: 4871
ITEMS:
1 - Correcting Electronic Typewriters
ESTIMATED COST: $980
FUNDING SOURCE: Reserves and Contingency
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00120.4871.08610.2001 (General Fund, Justice of the Peace 7 Department, Special Equipment, and FY2001)

PROPOSED ACTION: Justice of the Peace 7 requests to purchase two typewriters. Their current typewriters are broken and cannot be repaired. A replacement is needed as soon as possible because of the necessity to type information on formatted documents utilized by the courts. Recommended by the Office of Budget Evaluation.

(2) DEPARTMENT: 2520
ITEMS:
1 - Desk
1 - Credenza
1 - Keyboard Drawer
ESTIMATED COST: $1,014.91
FUNDING SOURCE: Within Budget
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00105.2520.08410.2001 (Road and Bridge Fund, Road Precinct #2, Furniture and Equipment, FY2001)

PROPOSED ACTION: Road and Bridge District #2 has requested approval to purchase a Desk, Credenza and Keyboard Drawer for use by the Senior Administrative Assistant. This will be replacing the current 26 year old metal desk. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

(3) DEPARTMENT: 2520
ITEMS:
1 - Cordless Portable Telephone
ESTIMATED COST: $170.00
FUNDING SOURCE: Within Budget
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00105.2520.08520.2001 (Road and Bridge Fund, Road Precinct #2, Telecommunication Equipment, FY2001)
PROPOSED ACTION: Road and Bridge District #2 has requested approval to purchase a Cordless Portable Telephone to be utilized by the Shop Foreman while performing duties in areas of the facility that doesn't have a phone readily available. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

(4) DEPARTMENT: Personnel/Civil Service
ITEMS: 1 - Time Stamp Machine
ESTIMATED COST: $400
FUNDING SOURCE: Within Budget
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00105.2520.08610.2001 (General Fund, Personnel/Civil Service, Special Equipment, FY2001)

PROPOSED ACTION: The Personnel/Civil Service Department requests a new time stamp machine to be used to time stamp job application documents received at the Employment Division. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

(5) DEPARTMENT: Personnel/Civil Service
ITEMS: 1 - Network Printer (HP8150n)
ESTIMATED COST: $2,400
FUNDING SOURCE: Within Budget
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00105.2520.08630.2001 (General Fund, Personnel/Civil Service, Computer Hardware, FY2001)

PROPOSED ACTION: The Personnel/Civil Service Department requests a replacement network printer for the Employment Division. The current printer is several years old and slow and can no longer keep up with the printing volume brought about with the postings of County job vacancies on the County website. An average of 200 resumes per day are received by e-mail and printed by the Employment Division on top of their normal printing requirement. Recommended by the MIS Director.
**TELECOMMUNICATIONS REQUESTS**

**CSCD M-0107035** - requests to install a single-line phone with a speaker-phone to allow conference calls. Installation: $31.50; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

**Communications & Central Services** - requests:
**M-0107036** - to install one phone line to support monitor at each of the following tower sites: 715 Rowlett Road radio room and 1500 Langdon Road radio room. Installation: $150.00; monthly service increase: $78.00. **Recommended.**

**M-0107030** - to install additional IPE modules to George Allen and Frank Crowley PBX’s to allow more capacity for additional service. Installation: $9,950.00; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

**District Clerk** - requests:
**M-0107019** - to install four data-line cables on the 2nd floor of Frank Crowley Courts Building to provide access to County network. Installation: $181.08; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

**M-0107018** - to install a data-line cable in the 2nd floor of the Frank Crowley Courts Building to provide access to County network. Installation: $45.27; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

**DA Intake M-0107027** - requests to relocate coaxial cables in Room C-1 to the opposite wall. Installation: $243.00; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**

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

************