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Legislative Briefing – Friday, February 28, 2003 @ 9:30 a.m.,
Commissioners Courtroom
To: Members of the Commissioners Court  
From: Kenneth A. Mayfield, Dallas County Commissioner, District 4  
Subject: Request for Allocation of proceeds of GNMA Bonds  
To be utilized for the Dallas County PROJECT DIVERT program  
Date: February 19, 2003 (Revised version)

PROJECT DIVERT is a Dallas County community-based project being developed and implemented for the purpose of meeting the special needs of non-violent persons with a mental disability who have committed minor offenses. Program participants must be voluntary, non-violent and consent to participate in case management, follow-up, and community mental health services.

PROJECT DIVERT has three components:
1) Triage Center - emergency shelter and safe housing (3-10 days) where individuals can be observed and properly assessed for short and long-term service needs, including stabilization, treatment, transitional and permanent housing.
2) Transitional Housing
3) Permanent Housing

PROJECT DIVERT requests $761,856 to be utilized for transitional housing. Transitional housing must be in place before the Triage Center can be operational.

BACKGROUND OF CURRENT SITUATION

Individuals with mental illness or mental retardation cycle through the revolving door of prison/jail and the community. Research illustrates that inmates: 1) with mental illnesses are more likely to be repeat offenders; 2) 49% of federal mental health inmates have three or more prior probation/incarceration arrests, compared to 28% without mental illness; 3) 44% had a current or prior violent offense, compared to 22% without mental illnesses; and 4) 10% of state mental health inmates committed 11 or more prior offenses. More than 75% of inmates with mental illnesses had been sentenced to prison, jail, or probation at least once prior to their current sentence. Approximately 50% of these reported three or more prior sentences. (Ditton’s 1999 Study)

Current Dallas County Jail Inmates with Potential for Inclusion in Target Population:
The Dallas Area NorthSTAR Authority (DANSA) gathered data from Dallas County and matched it against the State database to determine the number of individuals in the jail with a history of prior mental health treatment. The data was taken from December 1, 2001 to November 30, 2002. The total number of book-ins during that time period was 153,832, of which 31,073 or 20.33% of the charges to individuals with a prior history of mental health services in the State of Texas. The total number of individuals admitted to the County Jail during this time period was 85,544 of which mental health clients totaled 14,484, or 16.93% which is in line with the national average of 16%.

DANSA’s report also provides data on recidivism rate of individuals with mental illness in the County Jail. Of those individuals identified as having prior history of mental health services, 53% are single incident offenders and 47% are repeat offenders. The 6,804 repeat offenders account for 15% of the total
book-ins (felony, misdemeanor and city charges) at the jail. These individuals account for 14,635 misdemeanors or 9.5% of total book-ins. PROJECT DIVERT will allow for individuals committing these offenses to be diverted to emergency shelter where they will receive treatment, stabilization and housing. Even reaching a small number of the most frequent offenders could account for a significant reduction in the number of charges filed.

The report noted that there were 18 persons identified as having mental illness diagnosis with 20 or more charges in the one-year period studied; there were 27 felony and 499 misdemeanor charges.

There are two primary reasons for the recidivism:
(1) an inability to navigate the service delivery system and
(2) lack of housing.

There are a significant number of mental health clients with misdemeanor offenses that could benefit from a diversion program. The 19,877 misdemeanors accumulated by these individuals account for 13.01% of all charges filed at the jail. If a diversion program were undertaken even a modest 1% decrease would account for a reduction of 850 individuals over the course of one year.

If Dallas County spends $38/day on 850 inmates with mental health needs and those inmates were diverted to PROJECT DIVERT, that would be a cost savings to the County of $32,300 per day.

Mental Health Association (MHA) of Greater Dallas serves as the program administrator for PROJECT DIVERT. MHA has been serving the Dallas Area for more than 50 years. As a non-profit organization, MHA works to identify, assess and respond to the mental health needs of Dallas County. As such, MHA has evolved into a resource connection and broker for people who need mental health services. MHA has been extensively involved in the Dallas County PROJECT DIVERT and has received funding from the Meadows Foundation and Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals for certain components of the project. Hogg Foundation has committed funds contingent on matching dollars. MHA has applied for additional funding from the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). In addition, the Bush Administration has just announced $35 Million for a Permanent Housing Initiative to combat chronic homelessness. (In Dallas alone, reports show that at least 50% of homeless persons have a mental illness or disability.) Many Dallas agencies, including MHA, are desiring to join the City of Dallas to be the “lead” and to help write a grant for this funding for the Dallas area.

OPERATIONAL IMPACT

All 26-law enforcement agencies in Dallas County as well as some 30 additional social service agencies are participating in PROJECT DIVERT. Direct mental health services, for individuals meeting NorthSTAR eligibility, will be provided by the NorthSTAR Provider Network. Approximately 2,000 arrests are made annually of persons who would qualify for the project.

Dallas County GNMA revenue funds would provide the following rental assistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th># Units</th>
<th>Monthly $/Unit</th>
<th>Monthly $/# Units</th>
<th>2-Year Lease Expense</th>
<th>Annually <em>Persons Served</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$662</td>
<td>$7,944</td>
<td>$190,656</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>$571,856</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person per bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2 -
FINANCIAL IMPACT

It is estimated that the daily cost of incarcerating an individual with mental illness and providing the psychiatric services needed will exceed $38 per day. This estimated amount does not include the officer's time if the individual is booked. In addition, all 26-law enforcement entities in Dallas County have pledged to make officers available for training. PROJECT DIVERT is seeking $761,856 to provide housing for 2 years to 68 individuals with a mental disability who have committed a minor crime and have no housing. Using a conservative estimate, the cost to house a person under the PROJECT DIVERT program using GNMA proceeds is approximately $20.87 per day.

Procedures will be developed and implemented to track the savings to the county.

Similar to a program in Miami-Dade County, the program is expected to, in addition to the financial impact to the county, impact the aggravation of the business community by addressing the revolving doors of incarceration and the streets. Inasmuch as the project will be diverting individuals who would have received psychiatric services in the county jail, it is anticipated that the quality of psychiatric care within the jail will also be impacted, as the staff will have a reduced number of inmates with mental illness to treat.

POPULATION TO BE SERVED:

PROJECT DIVERT will serve adults with mental disabilities who have been:

- Identified by the Dallas County PROJECT DIVERT;
- Evaluated and referred by the PROJECT DIVERT Triage Unit;
- If mentally ill, enrolled by ValueOptions and deemed eligible for services including Psychiatric Rehabilitation services;
- If developmentally disabled; but not mentally ill, enrolled with the Dallas County Mental Retardation Authority for services;
- Determined to need transitional housing;
- Require supportive services while in the transitional housing program; and
- Voluntarily agree to be served in the program and comply with program rules and regulations.

Most participants are projected to be persons with serious mental illness (SMI). A person with serious mental illness (SMI) in the Texas Mental Health Service Delivery system is defined as a person with: Schizophrenia, a Bipolar Disorder, a Schizo-affective disorder, or a Major Depressive Disorder that is recurrent. Other diagnostic groups can be classified as SMI when a person's Global Assessment of Function (GAF) score is less than 50 points. Persons served may also have co-occurring disorders including: substance abuse; dually diagnosed, AIDS or related diseases, and victims of domestic violence. The target SMI population will include persons with intensive psychiatric rehabilitation needs to ensure symptom management, activities of daily living, proper nutrition, and a recovery lifestyle.

The PROJECT DIVERT Triage Unit will assess each person presented for evaluation and make clinical recommendations as indicated for: psychiatric treatment, counseling, psychiatric rehabilitation, and emergency and/or transitional housing.

If the consumer is enrolled in ValueOptions and has an assigned Specialty Provider Network, (SPN), the Triage Unit will contact the SPN, and coordinate a transfer of services back to the designated SPN. If the consumer does not have an assigned SPN, the Triage Unit will assign consumers to a SPN based on the clinical review and a goodness of fit to the most appropriate SPN to meet the consumer's needs.
If the consumer requires hospitalization, the Triage Unit will coordinate admission to Green Oaks Psychiatric Hospital.

Each participant served in this program will have been assessed by a licensed mental health professional in the PROJECT DIVERT Triage Unit and determined to meet criteria for admission to the transitional housing component of the PROJECT DIVERT program.

The assigned SPN’s will provide psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation for program participants in accordance with their ValueOptions NorthSTAR contract and the MRA will provide services in accordance with their TDMHMR contract.

ValueOptions NorthSTAR will pay for medication management, psychotherapy, psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation, but not housing or case management. This proposal requests $761,856 for rental assistance for the transitional housing piece of this project.

PROJECT DIVERT projects that over 95% of the persons served will be persons with a mental illness. Approximately 5% of the target population will be a person with mental retardation or other developmental disorder. Rental assistance for persons with a developmental disorder will be provided to Dallas Metrocare, the Mental Retardation Authority of Dallas County.

CASE MANAGEMENT:

The SPN’s will identify the housing units and furnish them and ensure that capacity to access the transitional housing is available within a five-day notice from the Triage Unit of the need for a transitional housing slot.

The program will operate in full compliance with local zoning laws and ensure full compliance with applicable fire and safety standards.

Each SPN will ensure that the housing is located within easy access to DART (Dallas Area Rapid Transit), grocery stores pharmacies, restaurants and community services. The SPN’s will make all reasonable measures to ensure client safety at all times including: (1) locating units in low crime areas; (2) ensure maintenance of fire safety equipment; (3) ensure participants are trained in basic safety issues; (4) provide staff monitoring to ensure safety regulations are met, and (5) ensure rapid access to emergency personnel for all emergent situations.

The SPN’s will provide skills development and symptom management in the participant’s residence, at site-based locations or in the community. Persons with SMI frequently have problems with generalization and it is best to teach these persons in the environment in which they will naturally utilize the skills. Therefore, many ADL skills (i.e., cooking skills, homemaker skills, grooming, laundry skills, etc.) will be taught in the home. Mobility training will be taught on the DART bus and routes. Grocery shopping skills will be taught at the grocery store. Vocational skills will be taught in a variety of locations including: site-based classrooms, Texas Workforce Commission, Texas Rehabilitation Commission, and supportive employment worksites.

The SPN staff will ensure participants access mainstream resources including physical healthcare, social security benefits, food stamps, vocational rehabilitation, and educational services. The assigned SPN will continue to serve all persons who can successfully move to housing provided by local housing authorities.

The SPN will track all clients and notify the Dallas County PROJECT DIVERT Administrator of all persons who are discharged from the Transitional Housing Program and the status of the current services.

Self-sufficiency. The goal for each participant will be to achieve self-sufficiency. The road to self-sufficiency will be unique for each individual served. Persons with the most severe symptoms (especially
when symptoms are chronic and treatment resistant) will be assisted to obtain Social Security benefits, Food Stamps, and limited supportive employment. Younger persons with less severe and chronic symptoms will also be assisted to obtain Social Security benefits, Food Stamps and more extensive supportive employment. All persons under the age of 65 years will be encouraged to work in either supportive or competitive employment. Volunteer work will also be encouraged.

RECOMMENDATION

Commissioner Mayfield recommends that $751,856 of the proceeds from the GNMA funds be utilized for transitional housing to serve 68 individuals for two years with a mental disability who have committed minor offenses and are homeless.

Recommended for Approval:

[Signature]

Kenneth A. Mayfield
County Commissioner, District 4
C. Rick Loessberg
MEMORANDUM

Date: February 19, 2003

To: Dallas County Commissioners Court

From: Michael K. Griffiths, Director

Subject: Amendment to the JIS Contract with The Harbour Group and Service Agreement with DIR

Background of Issue

Seventeen jurisdictions within Dallas County have pooled their funding from the federal Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) for the purpose of creating a centralized data base for juvenile records, called the Dallas County Juvenile Information System (JIS). The Harbour Group (THG) was awarded a contract in a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process to operate and complete enhancements to the JIS. The initial contract with THG was for the period of November 2000 through June 30, 2001. The contract was renewed for two subsequent terms, with the current contract period ending June 30, 2003. When the current contract extension was executed, $136,000 in JAIBG funds was not allocated pending a review of project needs specific to Dallas County. Two tasks have been identified that need to be completed before the end of the current contract period: electronic filing and integration of the new CaseWorker system. As part of the electronic filing task, a dedicated data link with the Department of Public Safety must be installed, which requires a service agreement with the state Department of Information Resources (DIR). The purpose of this briefing is to request Court approval of an amendment to the THG contract allocating funds to complete the two identified tasks and approval of a service agreement with DIR.

Impact on Operations and Maintenance

There is an Executive Committee that provides oversight for the entire JIS project. Commissioner Cantrell serves as the Chairman of the Executive Committee, which includes representatives from Dallas Police Department, Richardson Police Department, Irving Police Department, Dallas ISD, Wilmer-Hutchins ISD, Carrollton Municipal Courts, the District Attorney's office and the Juvenile Department. The Executive Committee has approved the allocation of funds to these two tasks. John Hennessey, Dallas County MIS Director, serves as an advisor to the Executive Committee and reviews all technical aspects of the JIS project. He has approved these two tasks. Mr. Hennessey has also reviewed the DIR service agreement and determined it to be a standard agreement and recommended approval. The outline of tasks to be completed by THG and the proposed service agreement are attached.

2600 Lone Star Drive, Box 5
Dallas, Texas 75212
(214) 698-2200
Electroníc Filing

THG is also working to develop an Adult Information System (AIS) that is based on the architecture of the JIS. Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) funds from the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division (CJD) were used to contract with THG to conduct an analysis of the development of the AIS. THG produced a general plan for development of the AIS, including recommendations for the purchase of computer hardware and software needed for the AIS. This equipment has been purchased using LLEBG funds. A key component of the AIS analysis was development of a process for the electronic reporting of required data to the state Department of Public Safety (DPS). Electronic reporting included the integration of LiveScan fingerprinting as required by DPS. The same basic electronic reporting process is needed for the JIS. A total of $92,087.11 will be required to complete the electronic filing task. There will be $86,146.51 allocated to THG to complete the development and integration. Electronic filing requires a dedicated data link to DPS. The state DIR manages such projects for all state agencies and requires that Dallas County enter into a service agreement with DIR. The implementation and ongoing access cost will be $1,640.50 through the June 30, 2003 end of the current JAIBG project period. Ongoing monthly cost thereafter are estimated at $275.10. The dedicated data line will also require a T-1 line to be acquired from SBC at an estimated cost of $4,300 for the rest of this project period, and ongoing estimates of $1,200 per month. The cost of the DIR agreement and data line will be paid by Dallas County directly from the JAIBG via purchase orders.

Integration of the updated CaseWorker system

The Dallas County Juvenile Department uses the state-supplied CaseWorker database system for collecting and reporting required information to the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC). The Juvenile Department relies almost solely on CaseWorker for all data needs. CaseWorker was developed by TJPC and provided to juvenile departments at no cost. CaseWorker is a DOS-based system that has become antiquated and not capable of meeting the state’s or local department’s needs. TJPC has been working for over a year in upgrading CaseWorker to a MS Windows-based product, using the SQL 2000 database system. We have needed this upgrade to SQL 2000 to completely integrate JIS and CaseWorker. JIS is also a SQL database system. Once integrated, there will be two-way, real-time communication between the two systems, resulting in a significant time savings to Juvenile Department staff. TJPC projects to start Beta testing of the upgraded CaseWorker in March 2003, with Dallas as a core testing site. A total of $44,687.84 will be added to the THG contract to complete the programming work needed to completely integrate the two systems.

Fiscal Impact

THG’s contract extension for the July 1, 2002 though June 30, 2003 period allocated $1,438,269.75 for work on the JIS. This was executed via Amendment No. 5 to their original contract. The additional $130,834.45 recommended at this time will increase the total funding to THG for work on the JIS for this contract period to $1,569,104.20. This funding includes $54,726 of required Dallas County matching funds. No other County funds are used in the JIS project. JAIBG funds of $5,940 will be used for the DIR service agreement and SBC data line. Amendments No. 6 and No. 7 to the THG contract allocated total CJIS funding of $361,000 for work on the AIS. Total funding awarded to THG for the current contract period is $1,930,104.
Legal Impact

The additional funds will be awarded to THG via Contract Amendment No. 8. The amendment is being prepared and will be forwarded to the District Attorney's office for review and approval. The amendment requires the signature of the Dallas County Judge. The DIR service agreement has been reviewed and approved by John Hennessey, and will also be forwarded to the DA for review. The service agreement requires the signature of the Dallas County Judge.

Project Schedule/Implementation

THG's current contract period expires June 30, 2003. The two additional tasks will be completed by the end of the current contract period.

Performance Measures

The JIS has been in full operation since June 2001. Currently there are 63 agencies providing data to the system, with 26 agencies using the JIS as their primary system for processing juvenile records. The following key performance measures for 2002 reflect the growing use of the system:

- Number of trained users with JIS access - 1,435
- Average number of user sessions per month - 1,833
- Arrests filed directly through JIS - 3,440
- Offenses filed through JIS - 10,547
- Cases filed with DA through JIS - 3,334
- Electronic School Notifications - 1,467

M/WBE Information

The Harbour Group proposed to utilize three certified subcontractors for the current contract period. Through January 2003 the FMJ Group has been paid $303,745, CPS/Lazo has been paid $94,326, and OC3Media has been paid $8,900, for total payments to certified subcontractors of $406,971. With total disbursements for this contract year of $960,829, THG is on target to meet their M/WBE projections of 42% for the current JIS contract period. The targeted M/WBE percentage for this amendment is 40%, with $51,987.50 targeted for certified subcontractors.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Dallas County Commissioners Court approve Amendment No. 8 to the contract with The Harbour Group for the Operation and Enhancement of the Dallas County Juvenile Information System and the service agreement with the Department of Information Resources and that the Dallas County Judge be authorized to sign both documents on behalf of Dallas County.

Recommended by: Michael K. Griffiths, Director
Phase IV Amendment No. 8
Contract Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Completion Dates</th>
<th>Completion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 16– Electronic Filing Proof of Concept/Prototype</td>
<td>530/03</td>
<td>$92,087.11</td>
<td>$92,087.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17– Caseworker Integration – Beta SQL 2000 Integration</td>
<td>613/03</td>
<td>$44,687.84</td>
<td>$44,687.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$136,774.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase IV Amendment No. 8
Deliverable Statements

Task 16 – Electronic Filing Proof of Concept/Prototype
- Integration of the Cross-Match LiveScan units & AFIX Tracker & Verifier with JIS
- Integration of the Digital Photographs captured during LiveScan with JIS; ability to view photo in JIS
- Implementation of fingerprint & photograph storage and access with JIS
- Integration of the Dallas County Fingerprint Database of Juvenile Offenders with JIS & AFIX Verifier
- Implementation of Electronic Fingerprinting with Book-in/Intake personnel - determination of staffing, services, service levels, and processes/procedures
- Implementation of Electronic Fingerprinting with District Clerk/Court personnel - determination of staffing, services, service levels, and/or processes/procedures
- Integration of the AFIX Tracker/Verifier with consolidation/records management process
- Development of the application functionality to set-up a digital lineup of photographs at municipal police agencies
- Implementation of Electronic Filing of CJIS forms (EAR) to DPS for Municipal Police Agencies through Dallas County
- Implementation of Electronic Filing of CJIS forms (EDR) to DPS with Juvenile Department Intake
- Implementation of Electronic Filing of CJIS forms (EDR) to DPS with Juvenile Department Deferred Prosecution
- Implementation of Electronic Filing of CJIS forms (EDR) to DPS with Juvenile District Attorney
- Implementation of Electronic Filing of CJIS forms (EDR) to DPS with District Clerk/District Court
- Development & Implementation of Business Process/Procedures for External Agencies
- Development of Electronic Filing Technical & User Documentation

Task 17 – Caseworker Integration – Beta SQL 2000 Integration
- Expanded integration between JIS and Caseworker - two-way communication; one data entry point
- Review of Beta Caseworker data tables & data elements
- Development of integration plans & functionality; coordination with various user groups
- Modification of existing code and application functionality to meet new integration requirements
- Testing and training of integration between Caseworker and JIS
- Implementation of the JIS & Beta SQL 2000 integration in the production environment
- Development of technical & user documentation
Harbour Advisory Consulting Resources
Project Executive - David Tedder
Sr. Project Manager - Tonya Brenneman
Sr. Consultant - Dan Rhodes
Sr. Database Administrator - Robert Moore

Lazo Technology aka CPSI
Operations Manager - Rebecca Lewis

FMJ Group
Development Manager - Marcelo Silva
Sr. Web Developer - John Chen
System Administrator/Web Developer - Frank Whitlock

OC3 Media
Sr. Network Analyst - Darron Roberson
### Total Hours/Cost Per Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Chen</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>23,781.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Lewis</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>8,967.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Moore</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16,719.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rhodes</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>45,892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darron Roberson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,764.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo Silva</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>31,708.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Resource Cost** $130,834.45

### Minority Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazo Technologies</td>
<td>6,787.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMJ, Inc.</td>
<td>42,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3 Media</td>
<td>3,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Minority Dollars** $51,987.50

| Minority % | 40% |
Department of Information Resources
Telecommunications Services Division
SERVICE AGREEMENT

This service agreement is between the Department of Information Resources/Telecommunications Services Division (DIR/TSD) and the Customer. It is the intent of the parties to comply with the provisions of Texas Government Code Chapter 771, Interagency Cooperative Act and/or Chapter 791 Interlocal Cooperation Act as applicable, and Title 10, Subtitle D, Chapter 2170, Telecommunication Services, Texas Government Code.

I. DIR/TSD Responsibilities
1.1 DIR/TSD agrees to provide Customer with connectivity through various transmission methods to the TEX-AN network for specific communications services including, but not limited to, video, voice, routed data, Internet and/or equipment (hereinafter “services”).

1.2 DIR/TSD will assist and advise the Customer in determining the best and most economical usage of services.

1.3 DIR/TSD will bill monthly for services as required and respond to inquiries regarding Customer's bill. DIR/TSD shall commence billing for services as they are provisioned.

II. Customer Responsibilities
2.1 The Customer will provide Purchase Orders (PO's) to DIR/TSD, for services, as ordered, which shall be valid for the entire term of this Service Agreement. Customer shall comply with the DIR rules applicable to the Telecommunications Services Division, 1 TAC Chapter 207, as the same may be amended from time to time.

2.2 Customer has the responsibility to cooperate and coordinate with DIR/TSD so as to avoid delaying DIR/TSD in the provisioning of and billing for ordered services. Specifically, it is the Customer's responsibility to designate, in a timely manner, the type of service desired and provide DIR/TSD with information which may effect technical, logistical, engineering, or equipment aspects of service delivery. The Customer is exclusively responsible for any equipment added to their premises for connectivity to TEXAN services. Customer shall keep DIR/TSD promptly informed of its billing contact, address, telephone numbers, Purchase Order numbers, eligibility status and technical contact, and changes to any of the foregoing. Customer understands and agrees that its failure to timely perform its duties which delay DIR/TSD in the delivery of ordered services is not a condition of Force Majeure.

2.3 Payments will be made in full within 30 days of receipt of an invoice or voucher prepared by DIR/TSD. Customer represents that it possesses sufficient current revenues to satisfy the timely payment of goods and services provided by DIR/TSD hereunder. In all events, Customer shall be billed for and shall pay in a timely manner for all services actually ordered and received up through the effective date of termination of services. Customer shall be responsible for issuing and maintaining the status of PO's. Customer agrees it has no rights to setoff against bills received from DIR/TSD. Customer's covenant to pay survives termination of this Service Agreement.

2.4 Customer is exclusively responsible for the operation and security of its premise equipment. The risk of toll fraud or other unauthorized use of its premise equipment rests with the Customer. Customer accepts this risk and understands that it shall be solely responsible to pay all charges, which may result from toll fraud or unauthorized use of its premise equipment. Customer hereby releases and waives any
claim it may have now or in the future against DIR/TSD for the payment of charges arising from toll fraud or other unauthorized use on its premise equipment.

2.5 Customer is a qualified entity to receive goods and services from DIR/TSD. Services will terminate without liability to DIR/TSD should Customer's eligibility status change during the term of this Service Agreement.

III. Term

The term of this Service Agreement begins on the date of the last party to sign and is in effect for the period through the end of the state's current fiscal year. The Service Agreement is annually renewable by the timely issuance of a PO by Customer, received prior to the end of the current contract term. In the event a new PO is not received in a timely manner, services will continue on a month-to-month basis until a new Purchase Order is received or termination of the Service Agreement is effected by compliance with Article V. hereof.

IV. Billing

4.1 Under the new billing system, scheduled to be operative during the summer of 2002, DIR/TSD's first month's billing for any circuits provisioned will commence on the date provisioning is completed. For all bills issued under the legacy billing system, the first month's bill will be for the entire month regardless of the day of the month provisioning is completed.

4.2 Under the new billing system, scheduled to be operative during the summer of 2002, DIR/TSD will cease billing circuits on the date disconnection is completed. For all bills under the legacy billing system, the last month's billing for circuits will be waived regardless of the day of the month the disconnect request is completed.

4.3 All other services shall be billed on an usage basis from the first date of actual service until the service is disconnected.

4.4 In compliance with Title I, Chapter 207, Rule number 207.5, of the Texas Administrative Code: inquiries, corrections, changes or modifications by Customers to the TEX-AN bill must be made in writing to the DIR/TSD within 60 days of issuance of bill. Any adjustments to the bill will be made in the subsequent billing period. This rule is being revised. Under the new version of the bill, which should be in effect before the end of September of 2002, the customer's billing dispute timing and payment obligations shall track those found in the Prompt Payment Act, Chapter 2251, Texas Government Code.

V. Termination and Amendments

5.1 TSD may provide notice of intent to terminate this Service Agreement for convenience by sending a written statement to that effect, which shall be received by Customer no less than thirty (30) days prior to the Effective Date of termination. TSD may terminate any Service Agreement for cause, with an immediate Effective Date, by issuing written notice to Customer, upon failure of Customer to make timely payment of bills.

5.2 A Customer may provide notice of intent to terminate this Service Agreement for convenience by sending a written statement to that effect, which shall be received by DIR/TSD no less than thirty (30) days prior to the Effective Date of termination. A Customer request to change a service shall not take effect until Customer provides written notice to DIR/TSD of any changes to ordered services. If DIR/TSD does not receive written notification, the Customer will continue to be billed monthly until proper notification is received. No written termination notice shall be effective prior to the expiration of thirty (30) days after receipt by DIR/TSD.
5.3 Amendments to this Service Agreement shall only be effective upon execution of an instrument in writing by authorized representatives of DIR/TSD and the Customer.

VI. Other Conditions of Service

6.1 Service rates are subject to change by DIR/TSD upon 30-days written notice to Customer.

6.2 No conflicting terms or conditions found in Customer orders or forms shall become a part of this Service Agreement.

6.3 If service and/or communications projects are canceled at any time prior to completion, Customer shall be responsible for all actual costs incurred by DIR/TSD up to the date of cancellation. DIR/TSD will bill the Customer for these costs. Customer’s covenant to pay shall survive the cancellation of a project.

6.4 DIR/TSD relies on third party contractors for the fulfillment of services contracted for hereunder. Therefore, DIR/TSD makes no independent warranties or guarantees, express or implied, regarding said services.

6.5 The following terms have the meaning indicated for purposes of this Service Agreement:

"Force Majeure" means the parties’ performance under this Service Agreement shall be adjusted or suspended by mutual agreement to the extent performance is beyond the reasonable control of the parties for reasons including, but not limited to: strikes, work stoppages, fire, water, flood, lightning, government action, acts of God or public enemy, delays of power company, local exchange company, or other carrier. Failure of Customer to coordinate and cooperate so as to delay DIR/TSD is not an event of Force Majeure. In the event of Force Majeure, the sole and exclusive remedy to the party suffering the delay shall be an equivalent extension of the time for performance. The parties shall document to one another the onset of events of Force Majeure within three days of their onset.

"Provision" and "provisioning" means DIR/TSD has acquired, arranged for or provided at the Customer’s site, the equipment, supplies or other items necessary to provide the ordered service(s), but does not mean the actual act(s) of turning up the ordered service(s).

VII. Customer Service Resources

Customer Service Resources may be found at www.texan.state.tx.us. Inquiries regarding this Service Agreement may be directed to DIR, Support Services Division, at (512) 463-3263.
Customer hereby agrees to the terms and conditions of this Service Agreement; represents that the official executing this Service Agreement is authorized to bind the Customer to its terms; and that Customer has completed all of its internal processes to make this a binding undertaking on the part of Customer.

CUSTOMER: ____________________________

BY: ____________________________

NAME: ____________________________

TITLE: ____________________________

DATE: ____________________________

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES

BY: ____________________________

NAME: Eddie Esquivel, Director

TITLE: Telecommunication Services Division, DIR

DATE: ____________________________
THIS PAGE WAS PURPOSELY OMITTED
THIS PAGE WAS PURPOSELY OMITTED
February 19, 2003

To: Members of the Commissioners Court

From: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D.
       Director of Human Resources/Civil Service

Subject: Employee Activities – 3rd Quarter FY 2003

Background
The Human Resources/Civil Service Department is requesting Commissioners Court approval to sponsor
the following employee activities during the months of April, May and June:

(1) Employee Educational Fair – will provide county employees with the latest information from
    over 20 local colleges, universities and technical schools. Last year, over 400 county employees
    visited the recruiting booths over a three hour time period. The Fair will be held in the downtown
    complex only.

(2) Employee Plant Exchange – will be held in conjunction with National Plant Day (April 18) and
    will provide employees the opportunity to bring and exchange a limited number of plant
    cuttings/seedlings and seeds. For example, an employee brings one plant cutting. The employee
    will receive one token to be used to select another plant cutting or package of seeds. The
    Exchange will be held in various locations/offices throughout Dallas County.

(3) Employee Book Exchange – is designed to involve employees in the recycling of their books and
    magazines. The model is the same as the plant exchange. Employee will be encouraged to bring
    a limited number of magazine/books, receive tokens, and then use those tokens to select other
    magazine/books. The Exchange will be held in various locations/offices throughout Dallas
    County.

Impact on Operations
The activities will be coordinated by the human resources/benefit representatives throughout Dallas
County and are offered as morale/team boosters for the workforce.

Financial Impact
All expenses will be paid out of the human resources/civil service budget and will not require additional
funds.

Recommendation
The Human Resources/Civil Service Department recommends Commissioners Court approve the
educational fair, the plant exchange, and the book exchange for Dallas County employees, with all
expenses to be paid out of the Human Resources/Civil Service Department's allocated budget.

Recommended by:

Mattye Mauldin-Taylor, Ph.D.

509 Main Street
Records Building
Dallas, Texas
Equal Opportunity Employer
214.653.7638
Date: February 19, 2003
To: Members of the Commissioners Court
From: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D., Director
Subject: Policy Exception – Reclassification Policy – District Attorney

Background
Mike Carnes, First Assistant District Attorney, is requesting an exception to the reclassification policy to allow an employee to retain her current salary. If allowed, the employee would be paid above the maximum of the new grade.

In November of 1999, the District Attorney’s Office underwent a reorganization, resulting in the number of attorney levels reduced from thirteen to nine. The employee in question was in a Felony 2 position at the time of the reorganization. She was inadvertently placed at the Attorney IV level. However, based on her duties, the employee should have been placed at the Attorney III level. Employees who were moved during the reorganization did not receive salary decreases if their salaries were within the range of the new grade. The department is requesting that the employee be allowed to retain her Attorney IV salary.

Section 86-439 of the Dallas County Code allows incumbents, at the time of reclassification, to maintain their salaries if they are within the new grade range. In accordance with the Code, the incumbent is allowed the maximum salary of the new grade, in this case Attorney III or $67,510.32 annually. The department requests that the employee be allowed to retain her current salary of $71,502.60.

Impact on Operations
Approval of this request will set a precedent and may require a review of past reclassifications, and a policy change may be appropriate in order to address future reclassifications.

Financial Impact
The additional annual financial impact (including FICA and retirement) is approximately $4,640.

Recommendation
The Human Resources/Civil Service Department does not recommend approval of this request as submitted by the District Attorney’s Office. Human Resources does recommend that the incumbent be allowed to retain her salary to the maximum of the salary range for an Attorney III. However, this entire request is respectfully submitted to Commissioners Court for further consideration.

Recommended by:

Matye Mauldin-Taylor, Ph.D.

Attachment
Attached is an internal memo regarding Lee Baldwin. Mr. Carnes would like to see if we can red line her position. I will be back in the office tomorrow for partial days.
TO: Mike Carnes

From: Kim Gilles

Date: February 6, 2003

Re: Lee Baldwin

This is a summary of the issues regarding the salary of Lee Baldwin.

Prior to you and Bill coming to the District Attorney’s Office, Lee Baldwin was assigned to the Juvenile Division and worked in the Child Welfare section. She was graded as a Felony 2 (mid-level felony trial attorney) under the system as it existed at the time. In May of 1998 Lee moved from the Juvenile Division’s Child Welfare section to its Juvenile Delinquency (J. D.) section. Lee did trial work while assigned to the Child Welfare section but became a Detention Hearings and Plea Docket lawyer when moved to the J. D. section. She remained at her grade and salary under the old plan when this move was made.

In November of 1999, the Dallas County District Attorneys Office underwent a reorganization in which the number of attorney grades were reduced and the names of the grades were changed. The existing Attorney 2 positions, including the one Lee was in, were renamed and became known as ADA IV positions. In addition, each job in the District Attorney’s office was evaluated to determine the appropriate salary for the job based on the level of work involved. Lee’s job as a Detention Hearing and Plea attorney was graded as an ADA III rather than an ADA IV based on job responsibilities. Organization Charts for each division within the office were also created. Two organization charts for the Juvenile Division are attached. One has position numbers and one does not. On the organization charts it can be seen that the Juvenile Division is divided into two separate sections. These sections are “Child Welfare” which litigates termination of parental rights and “Juvenile Delinquency” which litigates offenses committed by Juvenile offenders. The Juvenile Delinquency section (J. D. section) is further subdivided into two courts. District Attorney’s Office attorneys are assigned to these two District Courts. These courts are known as the 304th and the 305th Civil District Courts. There are five attorneys assigned to each of these two courts because of the multiple judges who conduct hearings and preside over trials simultaneously. The configuration for these J. D. courts is similar to the felony trial courts in that there is a Chief litigator (ADA V), mid-level litigator (ADA IV) and entry-level litigator (ADA III). The J. D. court staffing differs from felony in that there are five attorneys instead of three because of the multiple judges that sit in these courts. Each J.D. court contains a Chief trial attorney (ADA V), two mid-level trial attorneys (ADA IV) and two lower level attorneys (ADA III). One of the ADA III positions is the entry level trial attorney. The other ADA III position in each of these two courts is responsible for Detention Hearings and represents the State in agreed pleas before the judges. This ADA III position is not a litigator position. This ADA III position is similar to the ADA III “Magistrate Court” position found in the felony trial division.

When the reorganization of the office occurred in 1999, Lee was performing the job of detention hearings and pleas (graded as an ADA III). At that time, she should have been placed on the organization chart and in the court order as an ADA III. Because she had been paid as a Felony 2 and because Felony 2 positions were converted to ADA IV positions, she was inadvertently left in an ADA IV position on the organization chart and in the court order. See the attached organization chart that does contain position numbers. Lee’s position number is 3476. If Lee had been moved to the ADA III at that time she would have most likely been allowed to keep her salary regardless of the grade she was given. This is what occurred with numerous employees at the time of the reorganization as long as the salary was within the range for that grade. Once Lee was left doing detention hearing work and pleas (ADA III work) but also left in an ADA IV position, we had a problem situation that no one intended. The attorney who was doing mid-level trial (ADA IV) work was assigned to an ADA III position on the organization chart and court order. This also created a problem.

Then, as now, we have a mid-level trial attorney (an ADA IV by definition) who is assigned to an ADA III payslot and being paid as an ADA III because Lee is occupying an ADA IV slot to which she is not
entitled. This is exactly the type of situation we sought to avoid and have avoided in the reorganization of the office. There is no questioning our commitment to pay the correct salary for the job being performed rather than paying the individual any given salary regardless of the job being done.

There are two possible solutions to this problem. The first is to change Lee’s responsibilities and require her to assume J. D. mid-level trial duties (ADA IV duties). This would allow her to maintain her ADA IV position and salary. The other solution is to allow her to continue with her Detention Hearing and Plea duties (ADA III duties) and move her to an ADA III position. I am told that option one is not feasible as Lee was allowed to litigate a few J. D. cases in order to assess her trial skills and was found to be lacking in this area. Under this scenario, Lee must then move to an ADA III in order to continue in her role as Detention Hearing and Plea attorney. The mid-level litigator (Rex Anderson) who is doing the mid-level trial work must be moved to the ADA IV salary.

The difficulty in accomplishing this change lies in the fact that a move to a lower grade is generally viewed as a “demotion” under County policy. Lee is having difficulty with this concept and does not understand why she would be “demoted” when she is doing a “good job” as Detention Hearing and Plea attorney and when she would still be doing the same work after the “demotion.” She has, therefore, contacted the Personnel Department and the Commissioners Court. Regardless of Lee’s understanding of the issue, the bottom line is that if general policy is followed, the only way to move Lee down to an ADA III position and to move Rex up to an ADA IV position is to “demote” Lee. As with any general rule, there are exceptions. Any exception to a general County policy requires the assistance of departments outside of the District Attorney’s office. To obtain an exception for Lee at this point in time, the Personnel (Human Resources) Department and the Office of Budget and Evaluation will have to be advised in writing of the situation. They will determine whether or not the situation qualifies for an exception request and also advise us on whether or not the request will need to be briefed to the Commissioners Court. If the issue is briefed to the Court, these two departments will make a recommendation to the court regarding the appropriate salary for Lee.

An exception to the “demotion” rule can and has been made in certain limited and unique situations. The present situation could arguably be viewed as unique since it arose out of the reorganization process and was overlooked at that time. If this had not been overlooked at that time and a proper grade had been assigned then, it is highly likely that Lee would have been allowed to keep her salary while changing grades as long as her salary was in the range for that grade. It is possible that an exception will be made for her now allowing her to keep her current salary while being moved to the ADA III position. This would allow our J.D. section to be properly organized, Rex Anderson to be properly paid, and Lee to suffer no harm in the process. As stated earlier, if she is allowed to maintain her current salary while moving to the ADA III position, she must be paid a salary that is in the range for a Grade III. Lee’s salary is within the range for an ADA IV but is above the range for an ADA III. Therefore, to keep her current salary, Lee would not only have to be granted an exception to the general demotion policy, she would also have to have her salary “red-lined.” This term refers to those employees who are not allowed to receive pay increases until such time as the range for the grade moves up to the point that the employee’s salary is within it. In Lee’s case, her annual salary is at $71,502.60. The maximum annual salary for an ADA III is $67,510.32. If Lee were allowed to keep her $71,502.60 salary, she would be above the range and would not be allowed to receive any pay increases until the salary range for an ADA III moves enough that it exceeds Lee’s salary amount. Her salary is frozen or “red-lined” until that future date. It is possible that this “red-line” status would be given to Lee.

We need to proceed with moving Lee to the ADA III position and moving Rex Anderson to the ADA IV position that Lee currently occupies. This can be done as a demotion under general policy or with a request for an exception. If we are going to request an exception, I would suggest that we contact the Human Resources and Budget Offices and advise them in writing of our situation. I do not know what the outcome for Lee will be. Regardless of the outcome, the process for an exception will be a lengthy one. The sooner we address this issue the better. Please let me know how you wish to proceed with this matter.
February 14, 2003

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court

FROM: Willa Roberts, Purchasing Supervisor

SUBJECT: Contract Extension: Bid Number 2002-070-1890 “Annual Contract for Window Washing”

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

On March 12, 2002, the Commissioners Court, at their regularly scheduled session, authorized the award of Bid No., 2002-070-1890 to Citywide Building Services, Inc., for the period of April 13, 2002 through April 12, 2003. The contract provides window washing services for Dallas County. In accordance with contract terms and upon mutual agreement, the contract may be extended for the two additional twelve month periods based on the existing terms, conditions and pricing. As a result of Citywide Building Services, Inc., compliance with contract specifications, the County exercise the first twelve month extension option contained within Bid #2002-070-1890.

Citywide Building Services has agreed to extend the contract for the above mentioned services in accordance with the existing terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded. Insurance requirements are in compliance with the bid.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Wherefore, should the Commissioners Court concur with extending Bid# 2002-070-1890 for an additional twelve month period. It is anticipated that Dallas County will incur annual expenditures totaling approximately $26,899.00, based upon previous year statistics.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of the Purchasing Department that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorizes the first twelve (12) month extension of Bid No 2002-070-1890, effective April 13, 2003 through April 12, 2004.

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

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

Phillip Vasquez, Purchasing Director
# Dallas County Vendor Statistical Report

Permanently Full-Time Employment (not part-time/employment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE</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>Official/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>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clasical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Sem Skilled)</td>
<td>15</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>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE</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>Official/Managers</td>
<td>2</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/Clasical</td>
<td>2</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 (Sem 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>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL |       |       |          |                 |               |              |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority-Owned Firm Certification #</th>
<th>Issued by Narcia</th>
<th>Signature/Date: Linda Amador 1/13/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women-Owned Firm Certification #</td>
<td>Issued by Narcia</td>
<td>Typed Name and Title: Linda Amador, vice-president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority Owned Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 25, 2003

TO:       The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM:     Scott McDowell, Senior Buyer
SUBJECT:  Insurance compliance for Annual Contract for X-ray Technician, Bid No. 2002-084-1104

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

The Dallas County Commissioners Court awarded Bid No. 2002-084-1104, Annual Contract for X-ray Technician, to Medical Professionals, Inc. on March 26, 2002 per Court Order 2002-538. The contract was utilized by the Health and Human Services Department and provided for an x-ray technician to work in the TB Clinic and Lew Sterrett Jail Medical Clinic. One of the contractual requirements of Bid No. 2002-084-1104 was that the vendor must have and show proof of workers compensation insurance. Some time in May 2002, it was discovered that the workers compensation insurance coverage carried by Medical Professionals, Inc. had expired and they were not able to obtain new workers compensation insurance coverage. As a result, work was stopped, Bid No. 2002-084-1104 was canceled per Court Order 2002-1752 and the Dallas County Auditor withheld payment of invoices totaling $4,667.00.

It is the understanding that an employee must notify the employer of an injury within thirty days of the injury. In addition, in accordance with Texas Labor Code, Section 409.003, an employee must file a claim for compensation for an injury not later that one year after the date of the injury. As of this date, no claims have been filed related to this issue according to the Worker’s Compensation Board. To Medical Professionals, Inc. and Dallas County’s knowledge, there have been no adverse occurrences which caused bodily damage during the time Medical Professionals, Inc. performed work on Dallas County property without workers compensation insurance coverage. Accordingly, attached are signed Affidavit forms which were prepared by the Civil Section, Dallas County District Attorney’s Office.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The Dallas County Auditor is holding $4,667.00 in payments to Medical Professionals, Inc.

RECOMMENDATION

Bid No. 2002-084-1104 has been canceled and Medical Professionals, Inc. has signed the prepared Affidavits. As a result, the Purchasing Department recommends that the Commissioners Court authorizes the Dallas County Auditor to process invoices for payment to Medical Professionals, Inc. in the amount of $4,667.00.

Should the Court Concur with the recommendation, a Court Order will be scheduled for the next regular agenda.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Phillip I. Vasquez, Purchasing Director/sm
AFFIDAVIT OF LISA BOWERS

STATE OF TEXAS §
COUNTY OF DALLAS §

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority personally appeared Lisa Bowers, Individually and as Office Manager of Medical Professionals, Inc., who after being by me first duly sworn, deposed and stated as follows:

"My name is Lisa Bowers appearing herein individually and as Office Manager of Medical Professionals, Inc. I am over 21 years of age, of sound mind, authorized and fully competent to make this affidavit. I have never been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude. I have personal knowledge of the facts and representations stated for the reasons stated herein, and such facts and representations are true and correct."

"My name is Lisa Bowers. I am the Office Manager of Medical Professionals, Inc. located at 3401 Custer Rd., Plano, Texas 75023. Dallas County issued Request for Proposal No. 2002-084-1104 (hereinafter "RFP"). Medical Professionals, Inc. responded to the RFP on or before March 18, 2002, and by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-538 was selected to accomplish the work as shown in both the RFP and my Bid Proposal dated April 2, 2002. RFP provision three (3) required the successful contractor to maintain Workers' Compensation Coverage meeting the requirements established by the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A, Texas Labor Code. Medical Professionals, Inc. did not maintain Workers' Compensation Insurance as required by the proposed bid during the term of the RFP, March 26, 2002 to September 24, 2002 when the contract was cancelled by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-1752. I am not aware of any work-related injuries, illnesses or occupational diseases sustained by Medical Professionals' only employee, Stephanie Loader, who worked at Dallas County during the term of the RFP, but is no longer employed by Medical Professionals, Inc. Nor has Stephanie Loader given me notice of any work-related injury, illness, or occupational disease within the time limit required of such notice provided by the Texas Workers' Compensation Act. I do not have knowledge of an intent or plan by Stephanie Loader to file a Workers' Compensation claim."
"Further affiant sayeth not."

[Signature]
Lisa Bowers Office Manager of Medical Professionals, Inc.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED TO BEFORE ME, on this 14th day of February, 2003.

[Signature]
DORIS A. PARR
Notary Public, State of Texas
My Commission Expires October 30, 2005

Commission Expires 10-30-05

State of Texas
AFFIDAVIT OF ALMA SLAGLE

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF DALLAS §

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority personally appeared Alma Slagle, Individually and doing business as Medical Professionals, Inc., who after being by me first duly sworn, deposed and stated as follows:

"My name is Alma Slagle appearing herein individually and as president and sole owner of Medical Professionals, Inc. I am over 21 years of age, of sound mind, authorized and fully competent to make this affidavit. I have never been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude. I have personal knowledge of the facts and representations stated for the reasons stated herein, and such facts and representations are true and correct."

"My name is Alma Slagle. I am president and sole owner of Medical Professionals, Inc. located at 3401 Custer Rd., Plano, Texas 75023. Dallas County issued Request for Proposal No. 2002-084-1104 (hereinafter "RFP"). I responded to the RFP on or before March 18, 2002, and by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-538 was selected to accomplish the work as shown in both the RFP and my Bid Proposal dated April 2, 2002. RFP provision three (3) required the successful contractor to maintain Workers' Compensation Coverage meeting the requirements established by the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A, Texas Labor Code. I did not maintain Workers' Compensation Insurance as required by the proposed bid during the term of the RFP, March 26, 2002 to September 24, 2002 when the contract was cancelled by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-1752. I am not aware of any work-related injuries, illnesses or occupational diseases sustained by my only employee who worked at Dallas County during the term of the RFP, but is no longer employed by me. Nor has given me notice of any work-related injury, illness, or occupational disease within the time limit required of such notice provided by the Texas Workers' Compensation Act. I do not have knowledge of an intent or plan by to file a Workers' Compensation claim.

"Further affiant sayeth not."
SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED TO BEFORE ME, on this ___ day of

Alma Slagle Individually and d/b/a/
Medical Professionals, Inc.

WARREN JAMES SCHLEE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF TEXAS
My Comm. Exp. 04-01-06

04-01-2006
Commission Expires

Notary Public
State of Texas
COURT ORDER

ORDER NO. 2002-1752
DATE SEP 24 2002
STATE OF TEXAS ✓
COUNTY OF DALLAS ✓

BE IT REMEMBERED, at a regular meeting of the Commissioners Court of Dallas County, Texas, held on
the 24th day of September, 2002, on a motion made by
Mike Cantrell, Commissioner of District No. 2, and seconded by
Jim Jackson, Commissioner of District No. 1, the following order was adopted:

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2002 the Dallas County Commissioners Court awarded Bid No. 2002-084-1104 to Medical
Professionals, Inc. for X-ray Technician Service per Court Order 2002-538; and
WHEREAS, some time in May 2002 it was discovered that Medical Professionals, Inc. did not have general liability or workers
compensation insurance and would not be able to obtain such insurance in the future; and
WHEREAS, the Purchasing Department recommends that Bid No. 2002-084-1104 be canceled due to non-compliance with bid
specifications.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Dallas County Commissioners Court authorizes the
cancellation of Bid No. 2002-084-1104 due to non-compliance with bid specifications.

DONE IN OPEN COURT, this the 24th day of September, 2002.

Margaret Kelher, County Judge
Jim Jackson, Dist. #1
Mike Cantrell, Dist. #2
John Wiley Price, Dist. #3
Recommended By: Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director/sm

Kenneth A. Mayfield, Dist. #4
ABSENT
February 25, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

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

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator, Operations.


BACKGROUND: Court Order #2002-480 dated March 12, 2002 awarded the contract for Elevator Consulting Services a year ago to CMH & Associates. They have served well with all associated work in Part 1 and Part 2 required in Bid #2002-155-1199 and investigation work of elevator/escalator projects. Dallas County has the option to extend the contract for 12 months.

Engineering & Project Management has received a letter dated February 3, 2003 from CMH and are pleased to accept the extension for 12 months. (See attached)

IMPACT/OPERATIONS:
The objective is to continue to receive services for QEI (Qualified Elevator Inspections) of elevators and consulting help with elevator modernization at Dallas County.

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

M/WBE INFORMATION: N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Funding for elevator consultant services was appropriated in the FY2003 budget in Fund 120.1021.05590.2003 (General Fund, Operations – Engineering, Other Professional Fees, Year 2003) and in Fund 120.1021.02150.2003 (General Fund, Operations – Engineering, License and Permits Fees) for QEI Inspections performed by CMH. Estimated cost of elevator consultant services for FY2003 is $40,000.00.

RECOMMENDATION: Engineering and Project Management recommends that Commissioners Court approve the extension of contract for one year, March 12, 2003 to March 11, 2004, and that the County Judge be authorized to execute the appropriate contract documents.

Approved:

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

George L. Allen Sr. Courts Building
600 Commerce St., 9th Floor, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75202-6633
Tel: 214-653-6242
Fax: 214-653-6729
MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioners Court

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

SUBJECT: Amendment No. 1 to the Tax Foreclosure Resale Policy Allowing the Use of Modified Language in the Quitclaim Deed to Comply with the Procedures and Restrictions of Civil Order No. 5281

BACKGROUND

Commissioners Court Order 2000-396 dated February 22, 2000 established the Public Works Department’s Policies and Procedures for disposing of delinquent tax properties struck off to the County of Dallas at the Sheriff’s Sale. Included in the Policies and Procedures adopted by the Commissioners Court are the official Contract Documents and conveyance document (Quitclaim Deed) used by Dallas County to sell tax foreclosure properties to third party purchasers.

Several public school district's in Dallas County, hereinafter “Districts”, have requested that Dallas County modify the Quitclaim Deed to include restrictive covenants required in the Modified Order issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas styled United States v. State of Texas, Civil Order No. 5281 (E.D. Tex., August 9 and 15, 1973). The Texas Education Agency and all Texas school districts are subject to the order, compelling an end to any and all vestiges of discrimination in the Texas public schools.

All conveyances of real property by Texas school districts are included in 5281 and must be reviewed and/or approved by the Commissioner of Education. The review is to assure that the conveyance does not tend to perpetuate a dual school system and that the deed contains prescribed restrictive covenants, which prohibit any future discriminatory use of the property. The restrictive covenants include a reversionary clause which has caused title insurance companies to refuse to insure the title to prospective purchasers and has prevented prospective purchasers from obtaining adequate financing. As a result interested parties asked the court to modify the existing order.

On September 10, 1990 the court issued an order which provides an alternative to the reverter language of Section J(3) of the earlier Modified Order. In short, those public school districts that encounter difficulty in selling or leasing property may apply to the Texas Education Agency to use the substitute restriction attached to the September, 1990 order, as Exhibit “A”. This language creates deed restrictions rather than reverter of title, but requires additional approvals.

Since Dallas County, when conveying tax foreclosed properties to third party purchasers, executes the Quitclaim Deed in its own behalf and on behalf of the other taxing jurisdictions party to the tax judgment, i.e. city and school, the Districts have advised that Dallas County must include the language of the Modified Order, or the September 10, 1990 Order, if the consent of the District is to be required. The Districts are being conservative as sanctions for the failure to strictly comply with the Federal Court Order could result in the loss of Texas State Funding.
IMPACT ON OPERATIONS

Inclusion of the language of the Modified Order, or the September 10, 1990 Order, in the Quitclaim Deed will cause substantial difficulty in the ability of Dallas County to sell the real estate because of the problems associated with potential purchasers being able to obtain financing. The existence of the reversionary clause, requires title companies to write an exception in the title insurance policy so that the title insurance policy would not cover the possibility of reverter that is required to be contained in the deed pursuant to the Order. The existence of the exception in the title policy, together with the existence of the reversionary clause in the deed, make it virtually impossible for an outside purchaser to obtain financing to purchase the property which has caused title insurance companies to refuse to insure the title to prospective purchasers and has prevented prospective purchasers from obtaining adequate financing.

LEGAL INFORMATION

Pursuant to Section 34.05(i) of the Tax Code, the District and each taxing unit entitled to receive proceeds of the sale under the judgment, is required to consent to the sale of tax foreclosure properties, if the property is sold for less than the market value specified in the judgment of foreclosure; or (2) the total amount of the judgments against the property.

Several Districts, as a condition to providing consent under Section 34.05(i) of the Tax Code, are requiring Dallas County include the language of the Modified Order, or the September 10, 1990 Order, in the Quitclaim Deed and all future conveyance documents where the Districts have an interest in the property. Section J of the Modified Order mandates the Commissioner of Education to require the board of trustees of any school district desiring to sell or otherwise convey any interest in real property to include the reverter language of Section J (3) into the instrument of conveyance. Failure of the District to include the language in any conveyance instrument subjects it to the sanctions described in Section J (4) of the Modified Order.

The Dallas County District Attorney’s Office has reviewed Civil Order No. 5281 and concurs that the District is required to include the proposed language in sales of real property. The School Districts and their attorneys have determined that the language from Civil Order No. 5281 stating “…a district intends to sell, lease or otherwise convey any interest in real property…” “the language shall be incorporated into the instrument of conveyance, sale or lease…” to include the sale of tax properties.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES IMPACT

Amendment of the Tax Foreclosure Resale Policy allowing the use of a modified Quitclaim deed to comply with Civil Order 5281, will assist the department in obtaining timely consents from the Districts, thereby assisting the department in meeting its personal performance measures for FY 03 and future years.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Dallas County should expect to receive substantially lower bids or no bids on the properties that include the deed restriction/reverter language.
Commissioners Court
Page 3
February 19, 2003

RECOMMENDATION

In order to continue to timely dispose of tax foreclosure properties struck off to Dallas County, the Director of Public Works recommends: (1) that the Commissioners Court authorize the Property Division of the Dallas County Public Works Department to comply with the procedures and restrictions of Civil Order No. 5281, styled United States v. Texas, Civil Order No. 5281 (E.D. Tex., August 9 and 15, 1973), wherein Dallas County, as trustee, conveys any title or interest in real property on behalf of a particular school District which specifically requests that any conveyance or Quitclaim Deed be modified accordingly and (2) that the Tax Foreclosure Resale Policy adopted by Court Order 2000-396 be amended to allow the use of a modified Quitclaim Deed to comply with the procedures and restrictions of Civil Order No. 5281, either as a: (1) reverter, or (2) deed restriction, when requested by a District, said reverter and deed restriction language attached hereto.

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

APPROVED BY:

[Signature]
Donald R. Holzwarth, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Attachments
xc: Janet Ferguson, Chief, Civil District Attorney's Office
    David Childs, Tax Assessor/Collector
    J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator
    DeMetris Sampson, LINEBARGER, GOGGAN, BLAIR & SAMPSON, LLP
RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION J(3) OF THE MODIFIED ORDER STYLED UNITED STATES V. STATE OF TEXAS, CIVIL ORDER NO. 5281 (E.D. Tex., August 9 and 15, 1973)

"The further covenant, consideration and condition is that the following restrictions shall in all things be observed, followed and complied with:

(a) The above-described realty, or any part thereof, shall not be used in the operation of, or in conjunction with, any school or other institution of learning, study or instruction which discriminates against any person because of his race, color or national origin, regardless of whether such discrimination be effected by design or otherwise.

(b) The above-described realty, or any part thereof, shall not be used in the operation of, or in conjunction with, any school or other institution of learning, study or instruction which creates, maintains, reinforces, renew or encourages, or which tends to create, maintain, reinforce, renew or encourage, a dual school system.

These restrictions and conditions shall be binding upon GRANTEE, his heirs, personal representatives and assigns or its successors and assigns, as the case may be, for a period of fifty (50) years from the date hereof: and in case of a violation of either or both of the above restrictions, the estate herein granted shall, without entry or suit, immediately revert to and vest in the GRANTOR herein and its successors, this instrument shall be null and void, and GRANTOR and its successors shall be entitled to immediate possession of such premises and the improvements thereon; and no act of omission upon the part of GRANTOR herein and its successors shall be a waiver of the operation or enforcement of such condition.

The restriction set out in (a) above shall be construed to be for the benefit of any person prejudiced by its violation. The restriction specified in (b) above shall be construed to be for the benefit of any public school district or any person prejudiced by its violation."

SUBSTITUTE RESTRICTION ATTACHED TO THE SEPTEMBER 10, 1990 ORDER

"The further covenant, consideration and condition is that the following restrictions shall in all things be observed, followed, and complied with:

(a) The above-described realty, or any part thereof, shall not be used in the operation of, or in conjunction with, any school or other institution of learning, study or instruction which discriminates against any person because of his race, color or national origin, regardless of whether such discrimination be effected by design or otherwise.

(b) The above-described realty, or any part thereof, shall not be used in the operation of, or in conjunction with, any school or other institution of learning, study or instruction which creates, maintains, reinforces, renew or encourages, or which tends to create, maintain, reinforce, renew or encourage a dual school system.

These restrictions and conditions shall be binding upon [grantee, lessee, etc.], [name of grantee, lessee, etc.], [his heirs, personal representatives and assigns or its successors and assigns, as the case may be, for a period of fifty (50) years from the date thereof.

The foregoing restrictions and the other covenants hereafter set out are covenants running with the land, and each and every parcel thereof, and shall be fully binding upon any person, firm, partnership, corporation, trust, church, club, governmental body, or other organization or entity whatever (whether private or governmental in nature), without limitation, hereafter acquiring any estate, title, interest or
property in said land, whether by descent, devise, purchase or otherwise; and no act or omission upon the part of grantor herein, its successor and assigns, shall be a waiver of the operation or enforcement of such restrictions, but neither restriction shall be construed to be a condition subsequent or special limitation on the estate thereby conveyed.

It is further covenanted, that third party beneficiaries of the restrictions set forth above shall be as follows:

1. As to the restrictions set out in (a) above, any person prejudiced by its violation;
2. As to the restrictions set out in (b) above, any public school district or any person prejudiced by its violation;
3. As to either or both of the restrictions set out in (a) and (b) above, the United States of America, as plaintiff, and the American G.I. Forum, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), as intervenors, in U. S. v. Texas, Civil Action No. 5281, Tyler Division, U. S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas; reported in U. S. v. Texas, 321 F. Supp. 1043 (E.D. Tex. 1970); U. S. v. Texas, 330 F. Supp. 235 (E.D. Tex. 1971); aff’d with modifications sub nom, U. S. v. State of Texas and J. W. Edgar, et al., 447 F. 2d 441 (5 Cir. 1971); stay den. Sub nom. Edgar v. U. S., 404 U.S. 1206 (1971); cert den. 404 U. S. 1016 (1972).

It is further covenanted, that in case of a violation of either or both of the above restrictions, any of the third party beneficiaries above alluded to is authorized and empowered to prosecute proceedings at law or in equity against any person, firm, partnership, corporation, trust, church, club, governmental body or other organization or entity whatever (whether private or governmental in nature), without limitation:

(A) To enforce either or both of such restrictions relating to the use of the above-described realty;
(B) To abate or prevent violations of either or both of such restrictions; and
(C) To recover damages for a breach of either or both of such restrictions.

It is further covenanted, that if any third party beneficiary referred to above shall prosecute proceedings at law or in equity for the aforesaid purposes, such third party beneficiary may recover reasonable attorney’s fees from the violator or violators of either or both of such restrictions, if the court finds that the proceedings were necessary to bring about compliance therewith.
January 29, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

From: Chris Thompson, Director, Communications & Central Services

Subject: Options for Providing Cellular Phones

Background of Issue

Currently, Dallas County provides 489 cell phones to employees for County business at an annual cost of about $228,000. Of the total number of phones, 334 are assigned to individuals, 129 are assigned to pools with multiple users and 26 are maintained for emergency use ($6 per month plan). There are 42 phones funded by grants and for the purpose of this briefing they are included in the count of individual phones of 334. The purpose of this briefing is to respond to a request from the Court for staff to examine options that address how we provide cell phones for County business and the personal use of those phones by our employees.

CURRENT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$30 &amp; UNDER</th>
<th>$40 PLAN</th>
<th>$50 PLAN</th>
<th>$60 &amp; OVER</th>
<th>EMERGENCY AND POOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Recurring Expenditure</td>
<td>$56,202</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>$17,850</td>
<td>$57,732</td>
<td>$43,676</td>
<td>$185,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include air time, long distance or roaming

Attachment A summarizes the various plans in the categories above. Attachment B is a survey of the five largest counties along with Collin and Denton County. All counties except Collin and Tarrant have the employee reimburse for personal use. Collin and Tarrant have employees with a County phone pay a fixed monthly personal use fee. Dallas County has the fewest phones of any of the five largest counties.

This briefing will present three options that attempt to provide a fair and reasonable approach to providing mobile phones to County employees for business use while allowing for their personal use at no cost to the County's tax payers.
Impact on Operations

Staff has identified three options for the Court's consideration. It is felt each provides a fair balance between the County providing or covering the cost of a mobile phone for business use and the recovery or avoiding cost for the personal use of a County mobile phone.

OPTIONS

Option A - Current method; County provides the phone and employees reimburse 138% of the cost for personal use (3% federal excise tax and 35% administrative and indirect expenses). This is the same cost recovery formula used for reimbursement of personal long distance calls placed from County phones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides high degree of cost control.</td>
<td>• Requires extensive staff time to review monthly bills, process request for payment and to collect reimbursement for personal use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans are matched to use to minimize</td>
<td>• Contract must be reviewed and rebid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost.</td>
<td>• Must continuously monitor rate plans and utilization to insure efficient use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volume contract provides cost</td>
<td>• Very little recovery of cost for personal use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective rate plans and discounts on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recurring cost, air time and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option B - Employees are paid a monthly allowance to cover the cost for using their personal cell phone for County business. The allowance would be set at a reasonable amount to cover their actual out of pocket costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Easiest option to manage.</td>
<td>• Phone allowance will be considered income to the employee and subject to the appropriate deductions thereby increasing the County's cost for matching retirement and FICA contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires very little staff time.</td>
<td>• The opportunity for an employee to receive a cash allowance may increase the number of requests to participate in the new program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purpose of evaluating this option, we used the inventory exhibited on page one of this briefing and assigned an allowance based upon the current rate plan (i.e., $30, $40, $50, etc.). Since the IRS treats this type of allowance as income, the County’s cost is increased by the amount of the County’s matching payment for retirement and FICA. The employee that receives an allowance will be required to pay income tax and make their contribution for FICA and retirement. For example, a $50 allowance will cost the County $58 and the employee will net $32 (plus or minus) after taxes and deductions.

**Option C -** Through payroll deduction, employees pay an appropriate amount (for example, $10) to cover the cost of their personal use of the County owned cell phone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Personal use reimbursement is increased from $300 to $3340 per month.</td>
<td>• Employees may not like the mandatory personal use fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When the monthly payment is through payroll deduction, administrative cost to recover personal use reimbursement may be reduced.</td>
<td>• Will have to add and delete personal use fee as employees change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides high degree of cost control as County continues to match plans to use to minimize cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volume contract provides cost effective rate plans and discounts on recurring cost, air time and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Impact** -

The options are compared below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF CELLULAR PHONE OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 15% Monthly Access and Air time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Call Reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA (7.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our current method of providing cell phones (Option A) and recovering the cost for non-county use is a reasonable approach; however, many employees have expressed that writing the County a personal check for $13 8% of the cost is excessive and this has proven difficult to collect. Employees may not be coming forward to pay their reimbursement and departments may not be seriously managing cost recovery for personal use.

Analysis indicates that moving to a cellular allowance (Option B) would cost an additional $32,088 per year. This expense does not take into consideration the considerable staff time, distributed over the Auditor’s Office, Communications & Central Services, Schlumberger and the user departments that is required to process the current cellular bill, collect for personal use and manage the rate plans and equipment.

Each employee paying $10 per month (Option C) is the lowest cost option because of the increase in reimbursement for personal use of County cell phones. The projected cost recovery will be reduced if we experience an increase in personal use which will drive up air time charges. Other objections you should anticipate hearing regarding this option are some employees may feel they are unfairly being assess a monthly fee and air time charges that are not proportionate to their non-county use.

**Legal Impact**

The Civil District Attorney has determined that if it accomplishes a public purpose, the County can pay an employee a cell phone allowance and may charge an employee a set monthly fee to cover their personal use of a county cell phone. Dallas County, however, is not permitted by state law to deduct a cell phone personal use fee from an employee’s paycheck.

**Recommendation**

The option to provide a monthly allowance is clearly the most efficient from a staff prospective, however it will increase costs. The limitation from using payroll deduction to recover an employee’s monthly payment for their personal use of a county cell phone keeps this option from offering any real efficiency. Based on the above the following is recommended: (1) submit the additional cost to offer an allowance versus a county cell phone as a FY 04 budget PIR, (2) request a change in State law to allow the implementation of payroll deduction for the personal use of a county cell phone (3) make no change in policy at this time.
Attachment A - Summary of Available Cellular Plans

Currently there are approximately 30 different plans available for County use. These provide different combination of minutes and long distance and roaming options. Charges for additional minutes vary by rate plan. The typical plans comprising the categories reflect in the inventory table are as follows:

**$30 & UNDER PLANS**
$19.99 - 69 anytime minutes  
$29.99 - 287 anytime minutes with 1000 or 2000 night and weekend minutes depending upon current promotions

**$40 PLAN**
$39.99 - 460 anytime minutes with 2000 or 3000 night and weekend minutes depending upon current promotions

**$50 PLAN**
$49.99 - 690 anytime minutes with 2000 or 3000 night and weekend minutes depending upon current promotions

**$60 & OVER PLAN**
$59.99 - 450 anytime minutes with 1000 or 2000 night and weekend minutes depending upon current promotions and free long distance and roaming  
$69.50 - unlimited local minutes  
There are a few other plans in this category that provide the number of minutes required per month and free long distance and roaming. For instance, the phones assigned to Fugitive Division of the Sheriff Department are on a $79.99 plan - 750 anytime minutes with the number of night and weekend minutes depending upon the current promotion with free long distance and roaming and the Governmental Affairs phone is on a $99.99 plan - 900 anytime minutes with the number of night and weekend minutes depending upon the current promotion with free long distance and roaming.

**EMERGENCY & POOL**
$6.00 - no included minutes; all minutes are $0.60  
The majority of pool phones are on the $29.99 plan. These phones are included in the inventory table and comparison pricing table using their current rate plan.
### Attachment B - County Cellular Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Are phones provided by the County or through allowance?</th>
<th>If County provided, how is employee personal use handled?</th>
<th>Number of phones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Employee reimburses County</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Employee pays $5.00 per month</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Employee reimburses County</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Employee reimburses County</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>$10 per month payroll deduction or employee reimburses county</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Employee reimburses County</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 18, 2003

To: Commissioners Court
Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
From: Chris Thompson, Director, Communications & Central Services
Subject: Replacement of Van Assigned to the District Attorney’s Office

Background of Issue
Court Order No. 2000-2502 authorized the assignment of a 1992 Chevrolet mini van (unit number DA018) from surplus to the District Attorney. This vehicle now has 130,000 miles with a maintenance/repair to cost ratio of 73% and requires frequent repair. For these reasons, the District Attorney is requesting replacement of this vehicle with another surplus vehicle.

Impact on Operations
The District Attorney uses the vehicle to transfer records and supplies between the three buildings occupied by the District Attorney’s Office. Additionally, the van is used for transporting trial material and District Attorney personnel to and from courts, as well as when there are change of venue locations for major criminal cases.

The recent outsourcing of telecommunications moved TC001, a 2000 Ford van, from Communications & Central Services into surplus. Due to its larger size, this vehicle better accommodates the needs of the District Attorney than the currently assigned vehicle.

Financial Impact
Operating and maintenance costs will be paid by the District Attorney’s Office. These costs should decrease because TC001 is a dedicated compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicle and is much newer than DA018.

Recommendation
Authorize the replacement of DA018 with TC001. TC001 will be transferred from surplus to the District Attorney’s Office and DA018 will be removed from the inventory and sent to salvage.
Background

In January 2001, Commissioners Court signed a contract with Texas Local Interactive, an NIC company, to build, operate and support a website for the county. This is the regular monthly status report to the court on the status and progress of the county’s website.

Financial Impact

The following table reflects the transaction counts and dollar amounts processed via the internet. The website supports payments via credit cards, debit cards and electronic checks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>County Revenue</th>
<th>TLI Revenue</th>
<th>Credit &amp; Debit Cards</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Total</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>$215,073</td>
<td>$13,612</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>29,798</td>
<td>$2,019,432</td>
<td>$98,120</td>
<td>28,609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>$234,366</td>
<td>$7,031</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 YTD Totals</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>$234,366</td>
<td>$7,031</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Registrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,361</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$30,617</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$716</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 YTD Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$716</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>2003 Total</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2003 YTD Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Total</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>$113,841</td>
<td>$3,142</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>$3,677,238</td>
<td>$95,012</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$3,495,935</td>
<td>$104,878</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$3,495,935</td>
<td>$104,878</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felony Payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>$225,078</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$39,578</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$39,578</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective Orders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record Searches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>$1,502</td>
<td>$11,831</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>$4,575</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>539</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>$4,575</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Jury Postponement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>878</td>
<td></td>
<td>878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Employment Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Total</td>
<td>29,548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 YTD Totals</strong></td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Auto Citation Application

**2002 TOTAL**
- 439
- $65,679
- $1,970
- 439 Launched 11/1/02

**January**
- 392
- $61,570
- $1,847
- 392

**2003 YTD Totals**
- 392
- $61,570
- $1,847
- 392

**JP Courts**

**JP 2-1 Sholden**

**2002 TOTAL**
- 244
- $38,987
- $1,170
- 244 Launched 8/15/02

**2003**
- January
  - 40
  - $7,006
  - $210
- 40

**2003 YTD Totals**
- 40
- $7,006
- $210
- 40

**JP 2-2 Blackington**

**2002 TOTALS**
- 266
- $38,099
- $1,143
- 266 Launched 8/5/02

**2003**
- January
  - 90
  - $13,094
  - $393
- 90

**2003 YTD Totals**
- 90
- $13,094
- $393
- 90

**JP 3-1 Cercone**

**2002 TOTALS**
- 478
- $61,417
- $1,841
- 478 Launched 5/14/02

**2003**
- January
  - 92
  - $14,112
  - $423
- 92

**2003 YTD Totals**
- 92
- $14,112
- $423
- 92

**JP 3-2 Ellis**

**2002 TOTALS**
- 15
- $3,117
- $94
- 15 Launched 10/16/02

**2003**
- January
  - 22
  - $3,223
  - $97
- 22

**2002 YTD Totals**
- 22
- $3,223
- $97
- 22

**JP 3-3 Seider**

**2002 TOTALS**
- 82
- $8,363
- $251
- 82 Launched 10/16/02

**2003**
- January
  - 78
  - $9,965
  - $299
- 78

**2002 YTD Totals**
- 78
- $9,965
- $299
- 78

**Year To Date Grand Totals**
- 11,087
- $3,880,204
- $120,949
- 5,937

**Contract to Date Totals**
- 82,331
- $10,382,945
- $356,139
- 44,425
Operational Impact

This table summarizes general server activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Activity for Report Period</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Visits per Day on Weekdays</td>
<td>6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Hits per Day on Weekdays</td>
<td>494,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Visits per Weekend</td>
<td>7,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Hits per Weekend</td>
<td>293,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Active Day of the Week</td>
<td>Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Active Day of the Week</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Active Date</td>
<td>January 06, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hits on Most Active Date</td>
<td>617,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Active Date</td>
<td>January 01, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hits on Least Active Date</td>
<td>111,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Active Hour of the Day</td>
<td>10:00-10:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Active Hour of the Day</td>
<td>04:00-04:59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions

Visit: The number of times a visitor came to the web site regardless of any additional activity that occurs as a result of the visit.

Hit: A single action on the web server such as accessing a page, a document, a file or other images.

View: Hits to pages but without counting any supporting files, graphics or images on the page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Description</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>% of Total Views</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Avg. Time Viewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Home Page</td>
<td>128,888</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>57,362</td>
<td>00:01:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Property Taxes</td>
<td>45,993</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td>8,963</td>
<td>00:01:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>34,058</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>5,367</td>
<td>00:01:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Page</td>
<td>33,406</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>00:00:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Page</td>
<td>23,134</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>00:01:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Page</td>
<td>23,030</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>11,585</td>
<td>00:01:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Property Tax Payment Application</td>
<td>22,853</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>17,970</td>
<td>00:02:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Online Services Index</td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>19,203</td>
<td>00:00:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Page</td>
<td>18,747</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>00:00:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Employment Services</td>
<td>16,873</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>11,962</td>
<td>00:03:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Vehicle Registration Intro</td>
<td>16,399</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>13,001</td>
<td>00:02:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Online Record Search</td>
<td>13,545</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>10,826</td>
<td>00:01:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Property Tax</td>
<td>12,810</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>00:01:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Most Downloaded Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Jobs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/prof.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/prof.pdf</a></td>
<td>66,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Jobs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/clerical.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/clerical.pdf</a></td>
<td>21,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Jobs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/tech.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/tech.pdf</a></td>
<td>13,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Jobs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/parttime.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/parttime.pdf</a></td>
<td>12,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Application</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/emplapp.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/emplapp.pdf</a></td>
<td>6,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Jobs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/inhouse.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/inhouse.pdf</a></td>
<td>5,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO Job Description</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/dsodesc.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/dsodesc.pdf</a></td>
<td>2,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO Application</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/dsopapp.pdf">http://www.dallascounty.org/media/personnel-media/dsopapp.pdf</a></td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marketing Activities

#### Media Coverage
- GovTech
- Gov Biz
- Oak Cliff Tribune
- KRLD, KVIL, KISS Radio
Date: February 19, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

From: John M. Hennessey
MIS Director

Subject: Technology Strategy

**Background**

The County has several major significant technology projects in various stages of evaluation and implementation. These projects include:

- Jury Services RFP
- Civil Courts RFO
- Justice of the Peace System
- CUC Integrated Justice System Planning
- Consulting Engagement to evaluate "Build" versus "Buy" strategies
- Imaging
  - District Clerk
  - Sheriff (Intake)
- Kiboga Systems DILE
- Adult Information System Year 2
- Juvenile Information System Year 4 and Year 5
- Judicial Council on Information Technology/TexasOnline Electronic Filing
- Network Infrastructure Upgrade

The purpose of this briefing is to outline the current status of each project, identify next steps to be taken and recommend a technology strategy for the future that covers the integrated justice systems. Each of the above projects intersects to some degree with an integrated justice system.

There are other technology projects in progress or planned that are not addressed in this briefing but do have an impact on the network and support resources. These projects include the Kronos Assessment and pending upgrade of the Kronos time keeping software, the DA Hot Check program with an interface to the JP system, The Sheriff's AutoTicket program with an interface to the JP system, JP Collections, the County's Ticket Payment website and IVR system with interfaces to the JP system and a full upgrade of the Oracle financials system.
**JURY SERVICES RFP**
The goal of the Jury Services RFP is to enhance and improve the citizen's jury service experience. An RFP has been issued and 4 proposals initially received. The Court has been briefed on the 3 susceptible vendors and has requested additional information on the viability of continuing with the Jury Services RFP process. The lowest bid is in the $500,000 range with only $250,000 targeted for expenditure from the Major Technology Fund.

**CIVIL COURTS RFO**
The RFO is on hold pending the completion of the consulting engagement to evaluate the BUILD vs BUY decision. The Software Group (TSG) is the one remaining susceptible vendor since Hitachi Innovative Solutions, the other susceptible vendor, has withdrawn their offer. TSG has also put forth an offer to install the Odyssey civil courts system including Probate and Mental Illness courts and will also provide installation, training and conversion of existing data at the same cost the County would pay to hire consultants to evaluate the Build versus But decision. The offer is for a 1 year trial period. If the County opts not to continue with the Odyssey product it will be removed and the money refunded to the County. The Civil Courts system will require imaging and upgrades to the network infrastructure.

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE SYSTEM**
Schlumberger consultants from Denver have proposed the development of a JP system using a series of software tools to create/develop the system. This project is on hold pending the completion of the BUILD versus BUY consulting engagement. The JP system will require imaging and upgrades to the network infrastructure.

As part of the civil project discussed above, TSG will include an evaluation of Odyssey Case Manager by two JP courts. After the evaluation period, Dallas County would have the option to either exercise the full purchase of the Odyssey product, negotiate a services agreement to outsource courts IT (Odyssey) to TSG, or abandon the project.

**CUC INTEGRATED JUSTICE PROJECT**
The CUC Integrated Justice project was briefed to the Court last week. Phase 2 of the project proposes to hire consultants to develop standards, a complete set of justice system requirements and functional specifications and a comprehensive data dictionary. Phase 2 of the project is projected to span approximately 1 year ending in March 2004. Funding for phase 2 is to be provided by each county participating in the project.

**BUILD VERSUS BUY**
The Court has directed that outside consultants be utilized to determine the best approach to acquiring a civil courts package. The consultants will evaluate whether the county should buy a packaged solution, use a tool-box approach or a combination of strategies to acquire a solution. The proposed Scope of Work
document and suggested list of potential consultants are attached.

**IMAGING – COURTS SYSTEMS**
An imaging system will be required to support courts systems. It will also require major upgrades to the network infrastructure and desktops to provide adequate user response for use of images. The Court has approved the hiring of an Imaging System Administrator. The job opening has been posted and resumes are being received.

**IMAGING – DISTRICT CLERK**
The District Clerk currently has an imaging pilot project to scan and image minute books. This project needs to be expanded to include imaging of all court related documents. The system is based on imaging industry standards and equipment and is Oracle based. The software is used by many state and local governments and contains a workflow component. The expansion of this pilot project will also handle the needs of a Civil Courts system.

**IMAGING – SHERIFF INTAKE**
The Sheriff's Department currently has a dedicated turnkey imaging system for Intake. This system needs to be expanded to convert historical microfiche to imaging and work in conjunction with AIS Year 2 development of an Adult Intake module. Interfaces are also needed for Livescan and mug shot data.

**KIBOGA DILE SYSTEM**
This system has been reviewed by the Sheriff's Department and the Juvenile Department JIS Project. It provides real time acquisition of data for inquiry purposes. It appears to be most valuable to law enforcement officials doing investigative work or traffic stops. It is a web based product that can be interfaced to any type database for the collection and assimilation of data. The DILE system would interface with county court systems and JIS and AIS. The interfaces to County computer systems would be programmed by Kiboga staff with assistance from Schlumberger.

**ADULT INFORMATION SYSTEM Year 2**
Year 1 of the project identified the differences and similarities between the existing Juvenile Information System and an Adult system. The contract for Year 2 has just been awarded to The Harbour Group. Year 2 tasks will create a software development environment and the implementation of the Intake module. This functionality is linked with the expanded imaging needs of the Intake area.

**JUVENILE INFORMATION SYSTEM Year 4 and Year 5**
Two major tasks for Year 4 include electronic filing from police departments to the DA and electronic filing from the Juvenile Department to the State for DPS reporting. LLEBG funds have been utilized to acquire hardware to be used in building the electronic filing components. The pilot project will be initiated in JIS to prove the concept which will then be implemented in the AIS. Year 5 will see a shift from a development focus to a more operational/production basis as most of the software development will have been completed.
Judicial Council on Information Technology/TexasOnline ELECTRONIC FILING

This project is in the pilot stage. Two counties were identified as pilot counties – Fort Bend and Bexar counties. Ten counties have been identified as launch and design partners. Dallas, Harris, Travis, Tarrant, El Paso, Williamson, Hidalgo, and Upton counties are in this category. Fort Bend has just gone live. Law firms and attorneys file their cases electronically with an Electronic Filing Service Provider (EFSP) who in turn transmits the cases to the Electronic Filing Manager (TexasOnline). The EFSP collects all fees associated with the filing of a case and sends payment electronically to TexasOnline. Counties are entitled to have fees collected that will allow cost recovery based on the number of case filings. Fort Bend county is currently collecting $2 per case filed. The intent of this project is to submit cases electronically so that they may be integrated into court management systems without resorting to paper documents.

NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE

Regardless of the means of acquiring a courts system, the network equipment and desktop computers that will support both imaging and the courts system needs significant upgrade work. Many of the JP locations have already had network switch upgrades funded by LLEBG funds. Data circuit upgrades for JPs have also been briefed and approved. The funding model for the Civil and JP Courts system includes amounts necessary for both network upgrades and desktop upgrades.

Operational Impact

Jury Services

Two major areas that will provide benefit to the Jury Services staff are the juror check-in process and handling postponements. The web site currently handles postponements but needs an automated interface to the jury system to streamline the current process. The web site is currently handling approximately 300 postponement requests per month. Exemptions are not currently permitted by the judges either over the phone or via the web site.

At this time process improvements could be made in the existing system to expedite the juror check-in and postponement process. The purchase of industry standard scanning and imaging equipment to handle check-in and panel creations and automated shuffling may be initiated. This would require a modification to the existing jury summons to place a bar code on the summons. The summons would be scanned along with the information completed by jurors. This provides the jury service staff with fast information on jurors and allows the judges to see an image of the completed juror information. The postponement process can be enhanced by creating an interface from the website to the jury system. An IVR application could also be created to allow postponements over the phone.
Civil Courts
Regardless of the mechanism the County uses to obtain a Civil Courts system, the network infrastructure must be upgraded to support a distributed system with imaging as an essential component. The Civil Courts system should be implemented prior to the completion of the George Allen Courts Building expansion.

Justice of the Peace
The same network infrastructure and imaging issues that apply to Civil Courts also apply to JP courts. The Court has been briefed on the initial upgrade to data circuits to the various JP locations in support of the Sheriff's AutoTicket program. These data circuit upgrades will also support imaging and a new courts system at those facilities.

CUC Integrated Justice Project
The CUC project will facilitate the development of standards to be used in justice systems. It appears at this point in time that the County would obtain the greatest value from this project in the criminal systems area. Any Civil and/or JP system that the County acquires or develops should have the ability to adapt to the developing standards for data and reporting.

Imaging – Courts Systems
The implementation of imaging now in support of the Civil and JP courts systems would be a valuable start on the courts management system implementation. Industry standard hardware and software would be used so as to avoid any duplication of expenditures. Implementation of Imaging now in advance of a courts implementation would allow processes, procedures and equipment to be in place and allow staff time to adjust to new processes.

Imaging – District Clerk
The District Clerk is currently imaging family and civil minute books and also creating microfilm for archival storage as required by the State Librarian rules. They are ready to expand the project to begin imaging civil cases at the point of filing. Storage space for the pilot images is in need of expansion. Additional equipment will be needed to scan and store the case images. Once documents are imaged they can also be made available via the County website.

Imaging – Sheriff Intake
The existing historical microfiche should be converted to images and stored with the rest of the intake information. This conversion can be performed in house or outsourced depending the most economical process. Livescan data and AFIS data can be stored and linked to Intake information.

Kiboga DILE System
The system would require the use of Schlumberger resources to assist with the development of interfaces to the various county systems.
**Adult Information System Year 2**
Year 2 will focus on the hardware and software development environment and the implementation of the Adult Intake module. This module would interact with the existing Sheriff's Intake project.

**Juvenile Information System Year 4 and Year 5**
Year 4 of the project focuses on electronic filing to the DA and to the State (DPS) and will require imaging components to support the use of electronic filing. Year 5 tasks will be prioritized by the Steering Committee in the next several months.

**JCIT/TexasOnline Electronic Filing**
Dallas County does not have a case management system capable of receiving electronically filed cases via TexasOnline. The only way to utilize this service is to install printers and have the cases printed out and then filed as any other case submitted in paper format is filed. This is the same as the fax filing system currently in operation in the District Clerk's office. In order for cases to be filed, a payment mechanism must exist so that the filing fees can be entered into the receipting system at the time the case is filed.

**Network Infrastructure Upgrade**
The existing network infrastructure requires major improvements to support imaging, a civil courts system, a JP system and a criminal courts system. The equipment includes file servers, desktop and laptop computers, network equipment (switches and routers) and cabling. Redundancy must also be introduced so that single points of failure do not prevent the courts from continuing to operate.

**Financial Impact**

**Jury Services**
There is currently $250,000 budgeted for improvements. Proposals for standalone systems show projected costs exceeding $500,000. Improvements to the existing system could be implemented for less than the $250,000 budgeted in the Major Technology Fund. A copy of the Major Technology Fund is attached.

**Civil Courts System**
The Civil Courts system has been estimated at $7.1 million which includes hardware, software, desktop and network upgrades. Equipment costs represent approximately $3 million or 50% of the total Civil Courts project cost. Funding has been allocated in the Major Technology fund in FY02 through FY04.

**Justice of the Peace System**
The JP system has been estimated at $3 million which includes hardware, software, desktop and network upgrades. Equipment costs represent approximately $1.3 million or 43% of the total project. Funding has been allocated in the Major Technology Fund in FY02 through FY04.
CUC Integrated Justice Project
The CUC integrated justice project phase 2 will cost the County $92,000 in FY03 and $62,000 in FY04. Funds have been allocated in the Major Technology Fund.

Build versus Buy Consulting Engagement
This consulting engagement is projected to cost between $250,000 and $400,000. No funds have been allocated in the Major Technology Fund for this project.

Imaging – Court Systems
Costs for imaging as a major component of the Civil and JP systems have been included in the estimated Civil and JP project costs described above.

Imaging – District Clerk
The court has previously approved the District Clerk’s imaging initiative and placed the funds in the Major Technology Fund. The funds were developed as the result of canceling a microfilming contract and represent the accumulated savings for 2-3 years. There is $620,000 available in the Major Technology Fund targeted for expansion of the District Clerk Imaging project.

Kiboga DILE System
Kiboga’s proposal dated November 4, 2002 outlines the costs of the DILE system. The project is proposed as a 5 year contract with an initial payment of $220,000. Maintenance costs are projected at $240,000 per year. Total project price for 5 years is $1.4 million and includes a discount of $80,000. There are no funds targeted for this project in the Major Technology Fund. Mr. Charles Terrell has indicated that grant funds could be used to pay for this project and that Kiboga would work with the county to obtain those funds.

Adult Information System Year 2
The funding for the Adult Information System Year 2 is funded by a grant from the State of Texas governor’s office, Criminal Justice Division. This is a 4 year grant and the County has received approval for Year 2 funding. Each year award is $250,000 with County match of $83,333. The Harbour Group is under contract to the County for this project. Payments to The Harbour Group for Year 1 totaled $330,000.

Juvenile Information System Year 4 and Year 5
Funding for the Juvenile Information System is funded by a grant from the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) administered by the State of Texas, Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division. A Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) was created by Commissioner Cantrell to pool the grant awards of most of the jurisdictions within Dallas County. Each of the participating agencies transfers their award to the JCEC for development of the Juvenile Information System. Total funding for the JAIBG project, including all cash match amounts, was:
- Year 1 $1,380,831
• Year 2 $1,869,072
• Year 3 $1,814,142
• Year 4 $1,930,494

Year 5 funding, including all cash match amounts, is projected to be $1,612,233. Dallas County’s portion of Year 5 cash match is estimated at $46,000. The Harbour Group has a 3 year contract with the county for the development and operation of the Juvenile Information System. This contract expires at the end of June 2003.

Judicial Council on Information Technology/TexasOnline Electronic Filing
There are no funds allocated for participation in this initiative.

Network Infrastructure Upgrade
The funding for this project has been included as part of the Civil and JP Systems costs and included in the funds allocated in the Major Technology Fund. The projected costs for all infrastructure upgrades and equipment for the Civil (including Probate, Mental Illness, etc.) and JP systems is $4.46 million.

Legal Impact
The following legal issues require resolution:

• The Civil Courts Selection Committee and Process are on hold pending resolution by the DA on a best course of action to allow the Selection Committee members to interact with the “Build versus Buy” consultants, Schlumberger and civil courts vendors
• The 3-year contract with The Harbour Group for the implementation of the Juvenile Information System ends June 30, 2003 and cannot be extended
• The Harbour Group development efforts for the Adult Information System will also end on June 30, 2003 as the work is being done under an Amendment to the Juvenile Information System contract
• The County’s current receipting system does not support credit card payments for case filings across the counter. Payment must be made at the time of filing for the case to be accepted
• Electronic Filing of cases requires changes in the Local Rules which must be approved by The State Supreme Court.

Timelines
See the attached TIMLINES Exhibit for individual project information.

Recommendations
Jury Services
It is recommended that the RFP be canceled and no additional action be taken at this time due to pending acquisition of a courts system. The acquisition of a standalone jury service system should not be pursued at this time. The jury services function should be a component of a full courts management system. Canceling the RFP will provide an additional $250,000 in funding for the courts systems from the Major Technology Fund.
Network Infrastructure Upgrade
Move forward with a briefing to the Court on the network and desktop upgrades with a timeline. This project should be completed prior to any implementation of a courts system. This upgrade will support both imaging and civil and JP courts systems.

Imaging
Move forward with a briefing on Phase 2 of the District Clerk's imaging project and a briefing on the additional equipment needed for the Sheriff's Intake system.

Build versus Buy
Approve the attached Scope of Work for the project and authorize the MIS Director to obtain proposals from all of the suggested firms with a briefing to the court analyzing the responses.

Civil and JP Proposals
Authorize the MIS Director to obtain further clarification on the 2 proposals put forth by The Software Group.

CUC Phase 2
It is recommended that the County continue with Phase 2 of the CUC project but not delay either the Civil or JP system because of this.

Kiboga DILE
With all the activity surrounding imaging and courts system, there are insufficient resources to proceed forward at this time. Funding is an issue. This project should be evaluated for possible inclusion in the JIS Year 5 and/or AIS Year 3 initiatives.

JCIT/TexasOnline Electronic Filing
Dallas County should continue to monitor the progress of this project. It is premature for the County to join at this time since there is no courts system to receive the cases. The cases could only be printed out on paper. This project should be revisited when the courts system has been implemented. The county should also consider offering electronic filing directly into the new courts system.
Civil Courts / JP Courts
BUILD versus BUY Engagement
OBJECTIVES
02/19/03

☐ To BUILD or BUY a Justice System that:
  • Enhances judicial and department performance
  • Standardizes and streamlines case management
  • Provides for automated workflow such that required processes and steps cannot be bypassed
  • Has strong internal controls and statistical reporting
  • Minimizes manual procedures such as reconciliation and State reporting
  • Provides for automation of business rules
  • Supports a single point of data entry
  • Provides strong security and audit trail of all events
  • Is efficiently maintained and upgraded
  • Is affordable
  • Has Integrated modules
  • Can integrate with existing County Financial Systems
  • Can interface with other counties and the State of Texas as necessary
  • Supports Imaging and Electronic Filing

☐ SCOPE OF WORK
Utilizing the requirements outlined in the Civil Courts RFO and the requirements detailed by Schlumberger Analysts for the Justice of the Peace System:

  • Determine the viability of the “Build” approach using software tools to create a courts management system capable of providing all identified functionality for the Civil and Justice of the Peace courts

  • Determine the viability of the “Buy” approach to acquire a courts management system capable of providing all identified functionality for the Civil and Justice of the Peace courts

  • For each viable approach establish prioritized objectives and activities for determining:
    — The cost of maintenance upgrades and support and the impact on funding sources both long and short term
    — System’s ability to meet required needs with a cost benefit analysis
• Develop a high level analysis of system benefits and return on investment that can be achieved from implementation of an automated justice system.

• Evaluate both automation options and report on their ability to attain County objectives, achieve benefits and quantify their ability to provide a return on investment

• Develop an approach to go forward with the RFO and to evaluate the Civil and JP Courts projects using the different approaches and select the approach or combination of approaches that offers the best overall solution.

Factors to be analyzed include:

- Schedule (timeline) for full implementation
- Benefits (Operating & Revenue)
- Economies of scale and expandability
- Functionality
- Ability to perform as designed
- Probability of being successfully implemented
- Ease of maintainability
- Potential Staffing Impact
- Ability to leverage technology

If upon completion of the study the determination is such that the best approach is to BUY, continue the engagement by evaluating the susceptible vendor’s proposal based on the above criteria.
Civil Courts / JP Courts
BUILD versus BUY Engagement
List of Potential Consultants
02/19/03

1. The Harbour Group
2. ClearView Management Consultants
3. Deloitte and Touche
4. Peter Vogel, Gardere & Wynne
5. Experio
6. BearingPoint
## PART III: Major Technology Fund
### Funding for Civil Courts / Criminal Courts / JP

### Major Technology Fund (Fund 195)

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>(139,591)</td>
<td>656,909</td>
<td>1,514,481</td>
<td>665,846</td>
<td>7,342,660</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue - Property Tax</td>
<td>6,164,663</td>
<td>6,304,378</td>
<td>6,493,509</td>
<td>6,688,314</td>
<td>6,888,963</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings / Interfund Trans.</td>
<td>570,300</td>
<td>110,702</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>188,500</td>
<td>245,050</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>6,595,372</td>
<td>7,071,989</td>
<td>8,152,990</td>
<td>7,542,660</td>
<td>14,476,673</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Upgrade</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Courts System Replace,</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>4,294,730</td>
<td>1,395,686</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,190,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Urban Counties</td>
<td>92,733</td>
<td>61,822</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal / Warrants / Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>7,287,144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,187,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Touch Screen</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCD System</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Services Upgrade</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works 911/ GIS</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Tracking</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Records</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Case Billing</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Upgrade 111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Replacement Equipment</td>
<td>103,319</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,103,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Commerce Expansion</td>
<td>220,031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 34</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile - Probation Services</td>
<td>149,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Crime Lab Evidence</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>109,879</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Imaging</td>
<td>619,990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>619,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>6,177,019</td>
<td>5,938,483</td>
<td>5,557,508</td>
<td>7,487,144</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENDING BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>656,909</td>
<td>1,514,481</td>
<td>665,846</td>
<td>7,342,660</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve (10% of Expenditures)</td>
<td>593,846</td>
<td>555,751</td>
<td>748,714</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIMELINES

02/19/2003

Build vs Buy Analysis

Civil Courts Implementation - Buy (1)

Civil Courts Implementation - Build (2)

JP Implementation - Build (3)

GAC8 Expansion

Network Infrastructure

Imaging - District Clerk

Imaging - Sheriff Intake

CUC Phase 2

Juvenile Information System Yr 4

Adult Information System Yr 2

Juvenile Information System Yr 5

Adult Information System Yr 3

NOTES

1 - Timeframe obtained from TSG proposal

2 - Timeframe obtained from Schlumberger proposal. Timeline has been shortened to display on a single page but in reality continues through Aug 2006

3 - Timeframe obtained from Schlumberger proposal.
February 19, 2003

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: Ryan Brown, Budget Officer

FROM: Ronica L. Watkins, Senior Budget & Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Rationale for Briefing and Court Order on Same Day

It is requested that the attached item be considered on both the formal and briefing agenda for Tuesday, February 25, 2003 to expedite the application process. The deadline for signed applications was February 18, 2003. However, the deadline has been extended to allow for submission of this grant application.
February 19, 2003

TO: Commissioners Court
THROUGH: Ryan Brown, Budget Officer
FROM: Ronica L. Watkins, Senior Budget & Policy Analyst
SUBJECT: District Attorney’s Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Application

BACKGROUND

The US Department of Justice through the office of the US Attorney for North Texas is funding a project entitled Project Safe Neighborhoods. The Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) is a nationwide commitment to reduce gun crime in America by networking existing local programs that target gun crime and providing those programs with additional tools necessary to be successful. A task force has been formed which is known as the PSN Task Force. The agencies involved in developing the program include the Weed and Seed Committee, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms (ATF) the Drug Enforcement Agency, Dallas District Attorney’s Office, Director of Juvenile Services, Dallas City Attorney’s Office, Executive Director of the Greater Dallas Crime Commission, Director of Community Supervision and Corrections Department, the Dallas Independent School District, Dallas Police Department, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Members of the Dallas City Council, Baylor Healthcare System, and the University of Texas at Arlington among others. The prevalence of gun violence is widely known in this area and makes a great impact on Dallas County, in both the loss of live and in public funding required for apprehension and prosecution of gun related crimes. The problem effects both the adult justice system and the juvenile justice system equally.

The application is due February 18, 2003. However, due to the delayed notice of the availability of funds the deadline has been extended. The purpose of this briefing is to discuss this grant application and to make a recommendation regarding its submission.

OPERATIONAL IMPACT

The current case filing system does not provide for maintaining data on gun related crimes as a separate category. There is a need for the specific data as a separate category and the reporting of this data to the task force. There is a lack of personnel available to maintain and report on this data. The Office of US Attorney has funds available to fund a clerical position in the District Attorney’s Office to collect this data.
The District Attorney’s Office has the technology in place to generate the data, but does not have personnel to perform the function. The request is to fund one clerk grade 6 position to gather the information to report the PSN Task Force. The position duties will primarily consist of compiling and gathering data on gun related crimes. In addition, the clerk will review case files.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The grantee will be responsible for the outcome measures that are outlined in the grant guidelines. Primarily, the clerk position will be responsible for accurately gathering the data on the use of a gun in the commission of a crime filed with the District Attorney’s Office and the timely reporting of the data. As a condition of the grant all data collected as it relates to this project will be reported to the University of Texas at Arlington Crime Analyst.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There will be no financial impact on Dallas County. This grant will fund the salary and fringes for a clerk grade 6 position for a maximum of two years. The grant requests for funding is $66,602 to cover two years of salary and fringe benefits and requires no County cash match. Indirect cost recovery is not allowed under the funding source. Also, there is no requirement that the County continues the program upon the end of the two-year funding period.

LEGAL IMPACT:

There is no additional legal impact upon Dallas County as a result of this award. The US Attorney’s Office is the lead agent in the receipt of the funds from the US Department of Justice. However, the effectiveness of Project Safe Neighborhood is based on the ability of the federal, state and local agencies to cooperate in a unified manner to achieve the ultimate goal of the project which is to create safer neighborhoods by reducing gun violence and sustaining the reduction.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends submission of the grant application to the United States Attorney in the amount of $66,602 and does not require a County match. The project period is for two years with an anticipated start date of July 2003.
PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

GRANT APPLICATION

NAME OF ORGANIZATION

Dallas County
Dallas County Criminal District Attorney
133 N. Industrial Blvd., LB 19
Dallas, Texas 75207-4399

Attention: Kimberly Key Gilles, Administrative Attorney
kgilles@dallascounty.org
Phone: (214) 653-3616
Fax: (214) 653-2924

MISSION STATEMENT OF ORGANIZATION

Local Governmental Agency. This office prosecutes all cases of violation of state law.

AMOUNT OF GRANT REQUEST

Year 1 = $32,492.11 Year 2 = $34,110.37 2 Year Total = $66,602.48

LENGTH OF PROJECT

2 years.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA FOR WHICH FUNDING WILL BE UTILIZED (ZIP CODES)

Dallas County and all municipalities therein. All zip codes within Dallas County.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Review filings and dispositions of cases filed with the Dallas County Criminal District Attorney’s Office. Record the data for reporting of the data to the University of Texas at Arlington.

BUDGET NARRATIVE

The budget consists of the salary for a Grade 6 Clerk to collect, assemble and report the data on gun related crimes processed through the Office of the Dallas County District Attorney. The year 1 budget costs consist of the Salary, and Fringes consisting of FICA, Retirement, and Group Insurance with a 5% increase for year 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$24,315.20</td>
<td>$25,530.96</td>
<td>$49,846.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes</td>
<td>$8,176.90</td>
<td>$8,579.41</td>
<td>$16,756.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$32,492.14</td>
<td>$34,110.37</td>
<td>$66,602.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT

This person will be responsible for the accurate and timely gathering of information on the use of a gun in the commission of a crime filed with the Dallas County Criminal District Attorney’s Office. The information will be properly reported to the University of Texas at Arlington Crime Analyst.

SUSTAIN ABILITY

N/A

DECLARATION ENTITY IS A NON-PROFIT OR SUBMITTING GRANT IN THE CAPACITY OF A STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Dallas County is submitting this application as a Unit of Local Government of the State of Texas.
February 25, 2003

MISCELLANEOUS

1) FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT - requests approval of modifications to the Polk Street Construction projects that were approved by Commissioners Court on January 28, 2003.

The following modifications are changes to the Truancy Court and the associated waiting area as follows.

1) Modify and enclose with glass the waiting area to create a multi-use room that can double as a waiting area and auxiliary court as required and;

2) Modify and enlarge the Truancy Court Clerks office to create additional work space and file storage.

The costs for these changes are estimated at $9,000 and can be funded from FY2003 Permanent Improvement Minor Building Alterations (126.2003).

2) HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - requests authorization to unfreeze the Clerical Supervisor position, position number 8706, funded by the VD- Epidemiology grant for FY2003. The position was frozen in order to reduce the county match in FY2002, although for FY2003 there is not a County match required as TDH has increased funding in the salaries category of the grant. Recommended by the Office of Budget & Evaluation.

3) OFFICE OF BUDGET & EVALUATION - requests authorization to transfer unallocated funds in the amount of $63,451 to the Inmate Health Budget (5217) for outstanding operating invoices for FY2003. Expenditures in the Inmate Health Budget are fully reimbursed by Parkland. Recommended by the Office of Budget & Evaluation.

TRAVEL REQUESTS

4) PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - requests approval for:

a) Kathy Reid to attend the Appraisal Principals Course 110 in Plano, TX on March 16-22, 2003: $525.00 is available in General Fund, Public Works Department, Conference/Staff Development Account, FY Budget 2003, (00120.2010.2050.2003).

b) Craig Marek, Don Stringfellow, Curtis Brownlow, and Bill Stoll to participate in the International Right of Way, SR/WA Study Session & Conference
Examination Seminar in Austin, TX on March 25-28, 2003: $2,090.00 is available in General Fund, Public Works Department, Conference/Staff Development Account, FY Budget 2003, (00120.2010.2050.2003).

5) SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT - requests approval for:

a) Tim Ervin to attend Training for Project Spotlight in Austin, TX on March 24-27, 2003 in a County vehicle with gas credit cards and no other cost to Dallas County.

b) Captain James Ledford to attend TCLEOSE’s 1st Quarterly Meeting in Tyler, TX on March 5-6, 2003 in a County vehicle with gas credit cards and no other cost to Dallas County.

6) HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT - requests approval for:

a) Betty Culbreath-Lister to attend:
   - the Texas Public Health Association 78th Annual Educational Conference in San Antonio, TX on April 5-9, 2003: $956.60 is available in Grant Fund, Bioterrorism Department, Travel Account, FY Budget 2002, (00466.08723.02460.2002).

b) Gail Ausbrooks to attend the 37th National Immunization Conference in Chicago, Illinois on March 16-20, 2003: $1,749.50 is available in Grant Fund, Immunization Department, Conference Travel Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08708.02460.2003).

c) Cassandra Mims to attend the 37th National Immunization Conference in Chicago, Illinois on March 16-20, 2003: $1,749.50 is available in Grant Fund Immunization Department, Conference Travel Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08708.02460.2003).

d) Thomas J. Davis to attend/participate in the AIDS/STD Statewide Meeting at the request of the Arkansas Department of Health, Little Rock, Arkansas in DeGray Lake, Arkansas on March 24-26, 2003: $618.00 is available in Grant Fund, STD Training/CDC Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2002, (00466.8900.02460.2002).

e) Susan Kent, Eleanor Weddington, Patricia Minyard, Benjamin Olayinka, Gwen Graves, Janie Nichols, Patsy Stewart, Pam Sullivan, Christine Kellam-King to attend the 2003 Nursing Documentation Dangers Seminar
in Dallas, TX on March 3, 2003: $441.00 is available in Grant Fund, Elimination Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.8707.2460.2003).


**EXCEPTION TO TRAVEL REQUESTS**

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

**MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT**

(7) DEPARTMENT: 1210 Elections Department
ITEMS:
- 1 – Notebook Computer
- 1 – Printer

ESTIMATED COST: $5,400
FUNDING SOURCE: Chapter 19 Funds
EXPENDITURE SOURCES: 00120.1210.02093.2003 (General Fund, Elections Department, Computer Equipment less than $5,000, FY2003)

PROPOSED ACTION: The Elections Department requests to replace a notebook computer that was stolen and an unrepairable printer to be funded from the State Chapter 19 Funds. Recommended by Office of Budget and Evaluation and the MIS Director.

(8) DEPARTMENT: 1022 Facilities Management
ITEMS:
- 1 – Avery Scale

ESTIMATED COST: $0
FUNDING SOURCE: N/A (Surplus)
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: N/A

PROPOSED ACTION: The Facilities Management Department requests authorization to obtain an Avery Scale from surplus for use at the Crowley 2nd Floor snack bar to weigh food. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>2530</th>
<th>Road and Bridge District #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS:</td>
<td>1 - Pressure Washer/Steam Cleaner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED COST:</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE:</td>
<td>New Program Contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE SOURCE:</td>
<td>00105.2530.08610.2003 (Road and Bridge Fund, District #3, Special Equipment, FY2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACTION:</td>
<td>Road and Bridge District #3 requests authorization to purchase a replacement Pressure Washer/Steam Cleaner to keep vehicles and heavy equipment clean. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>1090</th>
<th>Data Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS:</td>
<td>1 - 18 GB Hard Drive for Netfinity 5000 Server</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED COST:</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE:</td>
<td>Within Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE SOURCE:</td>
<td>00120.1090.06520.2003 (General Fund, Data Services, Maintenance, FY2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACTION:</td>
<td>Data Services requests to purchase one 18 GB Drive for the Tax Office Interactive Voice Response System's (IVR) Netfinity 5000 Server to provide a redundant drive/ back-up and minimize the impact to the users of the system. The Tax Office IVR processed over 73,000 calls and over 29,000 fax requests in the last 13 months - calls that did not require Tax Office personnel involvement. The Server that runs the IVR system has only one disk drive. In the event that this drive fails, the system could be down for up to three weeks while a new drive is ordered, installed, and loaded. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>1090</th>
<th>Data Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS:</td>
<td>2 - Triplite Iso Bar 12 Power strips $110 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED COST:</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE:</td>
<td>Within Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE SOURCE:</td>
<td>00120.1090.06520.2003 (General Fund, Data Services, Maintenance, FY2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACTION:</td>
<td>Data Services requests to purchase two Triplite IsoBar 12 Power strips. Recently, a rack mounted power strip burned up in the Sterrett Building and shut down the Live Scan, Mugshot, and Intake Imaging Systems. The Network Team replaced the power strip with one of their own strips to get the systems up and running again. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and Human Services – Section 8 Program

1 – Sign

$755

Section 8 Program Budget

00466.0 2090.2003 0 0 08001 (Grant Fund 0, Property less than $5,000, FY2003, 0.0, Section 8 Program).

Health and Human Services requests authorization to purchase a sign for the seventh floor that reads, “Dallas County Housing Agency”. Currently there is not a sign that indicates that clients are in the right area to receive housing services. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

**TELECOMMUNICATIONS REQUESTS**

**Health & Human Services M-0302015** request to relocate a single-line phone from room 706 to room 740 and install a multi-line phone in room 740 for office changes. Installation: $82.50; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**Criminal District Court MD-0301002** request to install a data-line cable to provide access to network. Installation: $58.75; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**Health & Human Services M-0302006** request to relocate a multi-line phone to a new office on the 7th floor. Installation: $158.00; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**IT Services M-0301078** request to install a single-line phone in the front office area. Equipment: $37.50; Installation: $41.50, labor covered by contract; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**District Clerk M-0302005** request to install two single-line phones in room 325. Installation: $82.50; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**Tax Office M-0302037** request to install a multi-line phone on the ground floor of the Records Bldg. Installation: $80.98; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**Human Resources M-0302036** request to install three fax lines on the ground floor of the Records Bldg. Installation: $37.95; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

**Sheriff Intake Section MD-0302024** request to have a mainframe terminal relocated from office B1012 to the ID area. Installation: $223.75; no recurring cost. **Recommended.**

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