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A History of 2-1-1

Although most communities across the country have had an information and referral helpline for years, their telephone numbers are not as well known as the simple 9-1-1 for emergencies and 4-1-1 for directory assistance. 2-1-1, now operational in north Central Texas, gives information and referral lines a common identifier for residents across Texas and across the country.

On March 20, 2001, the Texas Public Utilities Commission (PUC) dedicated the use of the 2-1-1 dialing code in Texas for a health and human services helpline at the petition of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission. The Texas Legislature appropriated funds for a statewide system the previous year.

The PUC set guidelines for the implementation of the 2-1-1 service in Texas. The Texas Information and Referral Network, formed in 1997, built a statewide system of 25 Area Information Centers (AIC) in collaboration with United Ways, local information and referral providers (in North Central Texas, it is the Community Council of Greater Dallas) and state government. Each AIC will provide health and human services information through 2-1-1, with statewide, full-implementation planned by the end of 2003.

The United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta was the first to use the 2-1-1 abbreviated dialing code as an information and referral hotline in 1997. United Way of Connecticut turned their Info-Line into a centralized, statewide helpline using 2-1-1 in 1999 and experienced a 40 percent increase in calls seeking assistance.

Since 1998, a 2-1-1 collaborative has been working towards a nationwide 2-1-1 system, resulting in the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) July 2000 ruling that set aside 2-1-1 as the universal number for community information across the country.

Sixteen states currently have 2-1-1 services, and the remaining 34 are in the process of implementing and planning them. Half of all states are scheduled to have 2-1-1 operational by 2005. Furthermore, the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems (AIRS) is working to build a national 2-1-1 system using the existing infrastructure of the more than 5,000 information and referral agencies across America.
2-1-1 Update Report
General Information

• 2-1-1 serves more than 56 Million Americans – 20% of the U.S. population

• 65 active 2-1-1 systems in 21 states

• 83% of Texans now have 2-1-1 service

• Statewide Texas 2-1-1 took 79,000 calls in February

• 2-1-1 is now part of Homeland Security Operations
  - All First Responders have been briefed on 2-1-1
  - System now issues statewide alerts over 2-1-1
  - System diverts calls from one AIC to another in case of emergency
  - All AICs have Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plans on file with the state to assure continuous service

• Connecticut, Minnesota and Hawaii have statewide 2-1-1 service

• 2-1-1 is part of Homeland Security Operations
  - Texas 2-1-1 now distributes statewide alerts to all 2-1-1 centers

• “Phantom Calls” are still coming into many AICs. Telecom companies are making the necessary switch alterations.

• Statewide plan being developed for cell-phone users. 2-1-1 is not currently accessible from cell-phones.

Dallas Specific Information

• Dallas 2-1-1 Area Information Center (AIC), which serves Dallas, Collin, Denton, Kaufman, Rockwall, Ellis, Hunt and Navarro Counties, went live October 31, 2002.

• The State asked all AICs to operate in “stealth mode” until end of April 2003. That meant no publicity or marketing. This allowed time to get the various AICs hooked up and operating before telling the public at large.
• Dallas’ call volume has gone up 12% since going live with 2-1-1. The Dallas AIC does get some phantom calls, but far fewer than anywhere else in the state, due to the fact that our IVR was already in place prior to implementing 2-1-1.

• 2-1-1 is part of Homeland Security and VOAD in the Dallas Region. Memoranda of Understanding are established with:
  - American Red Cross
  - Salvation Army
  - Dallas Police Department
  - Dallas County Health & Human Services
  - Volunteer Center of North Texas

• 2-1-1 service is available 24/7. 7:00AM – 7:00PM calls are answered by a specialist. AICs are utilizing various methods for taking after-hours calls, including IVRs, call forwarding to another AIC, and answering on location. The Dallas 2-1-1 AIC is utilizing our Interactive Voice Response for after-hours and weekends. Dallas will be the first AIC to utilize remote answering by our own specialists for after-hours calls. This feature allows calls to be answered by a “soft-phone” at any remote location, allowing great freedom in where specialists are physically located. Remote answering will be online as soon as Cisco Systems installs the software (anticipated within a month). This feature also allows 2-1-1 to be present in the Emergency Command Center (City Hall Basement) in time of emergency.

• Some folks who try to call 2-1-1 cannot get through because they are calling from inside their company telephone PBX. They have to get an outside line, then dial 2-1-1 (just like calling 4-1-1). Some companies have blocked 3 digit dialing codes from being dialed from inside their PBXs, other than 9-1-1 for emergencies, and will need to make slight programming changes to allow 2-1-1 to be dialed from their PBX. This message will be part of the marketing campaign. We are already doing on-site testing in the eight counties the Dallas AIC services.

• State has just given the go-ahead for AICs to begin public promotion of 2-1-1. we now have the official state logo, tag line, and graphic standards.

• A joint press conference will be held with the Dallas and Tarrant County AICs on Tuesday April 22, 10:30AM at United Way of Tarrant County.

• Following the press conference, we will begin implementing our marketing and promotional campaign. Rita Cox, our PR consultant, will be in touch with Gaynell Henger in the next few days.
2-1-1 Fact Sheet

WHAT: 2-1-1 is a free dialing code for information and referral to health and human services in Texas. Dialing 2-1-1 connects callers to the Area Information Center, where a trained specialist will answer immediately and begin assessing the caller's needs, in English or Spanish. With a database of thousands of governmental and community service agencies at their fingertips, the specialists can quickly and efficiently identify the right solution to the caller's problem. It will soon be a 24-hour/7-day-a-week service.

2-1-1 directs individuals and families to thousands of Federal, State and community support services providing:
- Food
- Transportation
- Education
- Employment
- Housing
- Health care
- Aid to the Aging
- Child care
- Mental health care
- Substance abuse help
- Crisis intervention
- Services for the disabled
- Legal services
- Counseling
- Family support services
- Public health and safety
- Community services
- Financial assistance
- Consumer services
- Criminal justice
- Protective services
- Community information centers

WHEN: 2-1-1 became operational in the greater Dallas area beginning October 31, 2002. It will be available throughout Texas by the end of 2003.

WHERE: 2-1-1 for the North Central Texas Dallas region includes Dallas, Denton, Collin, Rockwall, Kaufman, Hunt, Ellis and Navarro Counties. The Area Information Center is located at the Community Council of Greater Dallas.

WHY: 2-1-1 makes it easier for people needing assistance to navigate the complex support system. Many times people have trouble accessing the services they need because they don't know whom or where to call.

WHO: 2-1-1 is a collaborative effort of the Community Council of Greater Dallas and the Texas Health and Human Services Commission, with support from the United Way of Metropolitan Dallas.

HOW: The 2-1-1 dialing code was dedicated as the universal number for community information across the country by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in 2000.
TO: Commissioners Court
THROUGH: Chris Thompson, Director
Communications and Central Services
FROM: Mark Weathersby, Radio Communications Manager
Communications and Central Services
SUBJECT: Renewal of Antenna Space Lease
Bank of America Plaza

Background

Dallas County currently leases space at the downtown Bank of America Building to support a portion of the County's radio communication system. This lease expires on May 31, 2003.

The purpose of the briefing is to discuss extending the lease at this location for an additional three years and four month period and to make a recommendation to the Court for consideration.

Operational Considerations

Extending the existing lease for an additional three years and four months will ensure continued support for the County's radio communications system. It should be noted that the additional four months are being incorporated to align this lease with the County's budget cycle.

Legal Considerations

The original lease was reviewed by the Civil District Attorney's Office and contains a fiscal funding clause. Extension for the new period is being facilitated by a first amendment to the original lease and all terms and provisions remain unchanged except for minor contact and address updates.

Financial Impact

Historically, the County has paid $525 per month for space on the 72nd floor where the communication equipment is placed, however, the landlord Telecommunication Properties has advised that rent for the new term will increase to $550 per month. This rate is comparable to other building-top communications sites which are utilized for wireless services.

Sufficient funding for this lease (including the increase) for the remaining four months of FY03 is available from the Communications and Central Services budget.

Recommendation

Communications and Central Services recommends extending the County's existing antenna space lease with Dallas Main L.P.-Bank of America, and Telecommunication Properties for an additional three years and four month period, at a monthly rate of $550, beginning June 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2006.
FIRST AMENDMENT TO RADIO ANTENNA LICENSE

THIS FIRST AMENDMENT TO RADIO ANTENNA LICENSE (this "Amendment") is executed as of ____________, 2003, by DALLAS MAIN L.P., a Delaware limited partnership ("Owner"), and COUNTY OF DALLAS, TEXAS, a corporate and political body and subdivision of the State of Texas ("Licensee").

BACKGROUND

A. Owner and Licensee entered into a Radio Antenna License with an unspecified date in the year 2000 pursuant to which Owner licensed to Licensee certain Space in the Building at 901 Main Street, Dallas, Dallas County, Texas, known as Bank of America Plaza for a term commencing June 1, 2000, and ending May 31, 2003 (the "License").

B. Owner and Licensee desire to extend the term of the License, and the parties have agreed to amend the License in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth herein.

OPERATIVE PROVISIONS

NOW, THEREFORE, for valuable consideration including the mutual covenants set forth herein, the receipt and sufficiency of which consideration are hereby acknowledged, Owner and Licensee agree as follows:

1. Defined Terms. All initial capitalized terms in this Amendment not defined in this Amendment shall have the meanings assigned to such terms in the License. By way of clarification, the term "Space" is intended to mean, collectively, both the space in the Equipment Room and the non-exclusive right to connect to the Master Antenna System described in parts (i) and (ii) of Section 2 of the Basic Provisions of the License except where the context requires that it refer only to the space in the Equipment Room.

2. Extension. The term of the License is hereby extended for three (3) years and four (4) months from June 1, 2003, to September 30, 2006.

3. Fees and Expenses. Commencing June 1, 2003, and continuing through the term of the extension, the Monthly License Fee shall be $550.00. Licensee shall also continue to be responsible for electricity in accordance with and to the extent provided in the License.

4. Construction. The names of Owner's Mechanical Engineer, Owner's Structural Engineer, and Owner's Telecommunications Manager set out in Section 5 of the Basic Provisions of the License are hereby amended as follows:
5. **Notice Addresses.** Owner’s addresses for notices and payment of fees in Section 8 of the Basic Provisions of the License are hereby amended and restated in their entirety as follows:

**To Owner for Payment of Fees and Expenses:**

Sunbelt Management Company  
c/o Bank of America, National Association  
P.O. Box 847823  
Dallas, Texas 75284-7823

**To Owner for Notices:**

Dallas Main L.P.  
c/o Telecommunications Properties, Inc.  
Attn.: President/General Manager  
901 Main Street, Suite 2600  
Dallas, Texas 75202

and

Dallas Main L.P.  
c/o Cushman & Wakefield of Texas, Inc.  
Attn.: R. Gregg Chilton, General Manager  
901 Main Street, Suite 6200  
Dallas, Texas 75202

and

Dallas Main L.P.  
c/o Sunbelt Management Company  
Attn.: Richard M. Reeves and Raymond G. Gardner  
220 Congress Park Drive, Suite 215  
Delray Beach, FL 33445

and

First Amendment 4-4-03
Robert F. See, Jr.
Robert F. See, Jr. & Associates, P.C.
901 Main Street, Suite 3601
Dallas, Texas 75202

Licensee’s address for notices in Section 8 of the Basic Provisions of the License is hereby amended and restated in its entirety as follows:

County of Dallas, Texas
Attn: Mark Weathersby,
Radio Communications Manager
509 Main Street, Room 608
Dallas, Texas 75202

6. Ratification of License. Except as amended hereby, the terms and provisions of the License shall remain unchanged. The License as modified hereby is hereby ratified and confirmed in all respects and shall remain in full force and effect. If there is a conflict between the License and this Amendment, this Amendment shall control.

7. Entire Agreement. This Amendment and the License contain all of the agreements of the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter thereof, and no prior agreement, understanding or representation pertaining to any such matter shall be effective for any purpose. The terms and conditions of the license as amended by this Amendment may not be amended or otherwise affected except by instrument in writing executed by Owner and Licensee.

8. Successors and Assigns. The terms and provisions hereof shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns; provided, that this provision shall not be construed to modify any provision of the License limiting Licensee’s right to assign, sublicense or otherwise transfer its interest in the License.

9. Paragraph Headings. The paragraph headings in this Amendment are for convenience only and shall in no way enlarge, limit or alter the meaning of the provisions hereof.

10. Background. The provisions of the Background section of this Amendment are an integral part of this Amendment.

11. Gender and Number. Within this Amendment, words of any gender shall be construed to include any other gender, and words in the singular number shall be construed to include the plural and words in the plural number shall be construed to include the singular, as the context may require.

12. Severability. A determination that any provision of this Amendment is unenforceable or invalid shall not affect the enforceability or validity of any other provision hereof, and any determination that the application of any provision of this Amendment to any person or circumstance is illegal or unenforceable shall not affect the enforceability or validity of such provision as it may apply to any other persons or circumstances.
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13. **Counterparts.** This Amendment may be executed in any number of counterparts with the same effect as if all parties hereto had signed the same document. All such counterparts shall be construed together and shall constitute one instrument, but in making proof hereof it shall only be necessary to produce one such counterpart. The signature pages of various counterparts may be combined onto one document.

14. **Representations of Licensee and Person Signing for Licensee.** Licensee and the person signing this Amendment on behalf of Licensee represent to Owner as follows: (a) Licensee is a corporate and political body and subdivision of the State of Texas; (b) the execution and delivery of, and performance under, this Amendment are within Licensee's power and authority without the joinder or consent of any party and have been duly authorized by Order No. ____________ of the Commissioners' Court of Dallas County, Texas, passed _______ ______, 2003; (c) the persons signing this Amendment on behalf of Licensee were and continue to be authorized to do so without the joinder of any other person; and (d) this Amendment constitutes the legal, valid and binding obligations of Licensee enforceable in accordance with its terms.

[Signatures on next page.]
EXECUTED as of the date first entered above.

OWNER:

DALLAS MAIN L.P.,
a Delaware limited partnership

By: Main Center Inc.,
a Delaware corporation, general partner

By: Richard M. Reeves
Authorized Signatory

By: Raymond G. Gardner
Authorized Signatory

APPROVED:

TELECOMMUNICATION PROPERTIES, INC.,
as telecommunications manager

By: James T. Chiles, President and CEO

By: Jerry Mull, General Manager

Date: ____________________________
LICENSEE:

COUNTY OF DALLAS, TEXAS
a corporate and political body and subdivision of
the State of Texas

By: ____________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

Attest:

__________________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
DATE: May 14, 2003

TO: COMMISSIONERS COURT

FROM: Betty J. Culbreath, Director

SUBJECT: REVISION OF THE SECTION 8 ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN

BACKGROUND
Dallas County Commissioners Court approved the Dallas County Health and Human Services revision to the Section 8 Administrative Plan per Court Order No. 2002 348. Dallas County Health and Human Services is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as specified in 24 CFR 982.54, to revise their administrative plans.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS
The revision of the Section 8 Administrative Plan will have no impact on operations. The revisions include the amending of Section IX. TERMINATION AND INFORMAL HEARINGS to include time lines, and the addition of Section X. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT. The content of the Administrative Plan has been revised for better comprehension and includes procedures of implementation for each section.

FISCAL IMPACT
There is no financial impact to Dallas County.

LEGAL IMPACT
The Commissioners Court must approve the revised Section 8 Administrative Plan.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve the revised Dallas County Health and Human Services Section 8 Administrative Plan as submitted.

RECOMMENDED BY: Betty J. Culbreath, Director

attachment
c: J. Allen Clemson, Court Administrator
Virginia Porter, County Auditor

2377 Stemmons Freeway
Suite 600 LB-16
Dallas, Texas 75207-2710
Office (214) 819-1858
FAX (214) 819-6022
DALLAS COUNTY
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER
PROGRAM
ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN

Dallas County Housing Agency
2377 North Stemmons Freeway, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75207-2710
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Administrative Plan
Dallas County Housing Choice Voucher Program

This Administrative Plan provides the guidelines for the operation of Dallas County’s Housing Choice Voucher Program. Administration of this program is in compliance with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations as specified in 24 CFR, HUD directives, Dallas County policy and this Plan. Dallas County complies with all Federal, State and local housing regulations.

Goal

The goal is to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing to very low-income families otherwise incapable of obtaining adequate housing. The number of families served is limited only by the funding available through local, state and national programs, Dallas County’s budget and the availability of adequate housing.
Dallas County Housing Agency (DCHA) is part of the Dallas County System governed by the Dallas County Commissioners Court. DCHA is located within the Human Services Division of the Dallas County Health and Human Services Department. DCHA is managed by Assistant Director of Housing, who is accountable to the Deputy Director.
Dallas County Housing Voucher Program

Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan

Section I. Introduction

This Administrative Plan has been prepared by the Dallas County Housing Agency in conformance with the requirements of 24 CFR 982.54. Certain procedural elements of the Housing process are described in administrative procedures referenced in this Plan. This Plan does not duplicate the requirements of the regulations cited below under which the program is administered. Rather, the plan indicates how the Dallas County Housing Agency is administering those aspects of the program left by HUD to the HA's discretion.

The plan sets forth PHA's policies for the administration of the program in accordance with the requirements of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Those requirements are incorporated by reference and not duplicated herein, as follows:

24 CFR 5 Definition of Income, Income Limits, Rent, and Regular Re-examination of Family Income for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program and other Related Programs

24 CFR 982 Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance: Housing Choice Voucher Program

24 CFR 984 Section 8 and Public Housing Family Self-Sufficiency Program

24 CFR 985 Section 8 Management Assessment Program (SEMAP)

The Plan is presented in the sequence in which events usually occur in the Housing process. It is intended only to establish local policies for administration of the program, and should not be considered an exhaustive treatment of the procedures by which these policies are implemented. The Plan is to be implemented using separate standard operating procedures which may be referenced in the Plan.

A. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

1. FAIR HOUSING

It is the policy of the HA to comply fully with all Federal, State, and local nondiscrimination laws, including but not limited to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans With Disabilities Act; and the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations governing Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.
No person shall, on the ground of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, familial status, age or disability be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any HA housing programs.

To further its commitment to full compliance with applicable Civil Rights laws, the HA will provide Federal/State/local information to applicants for and participants in the Housing Program regarding unlawful discrimination and any recourse available to them if they believe they may be victims of discrimination. Such information will be made available with the application, and all applicable Fair Housing Information and Discrimination Complaint Forms will be made available at the HA office. In addition, all written information and advertisements will contain the appropriate Equal Opportunity language and logo.

The HA will assist any family that believes they have suffered illegal discrimination by providing them copies of the housing discrimination form. The HA will also assist them in completing the form, if requested, and will provide them with the address of the nearest HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

2. **Reasonable Accommodation**

Sometimes people with disabilities may need a reasonable accommodation in order to take full advantage of the HA housing programs and related services. When such accommodations are granted they do not confer special treatment or advantage for the person with a disability; rather, they make the program fully accessible to them in a way that would otherwise not be possible due to their disability. This policy clarifies how people can request accommodations and the guidelines the HA will follow in determining whether it is reasonable to provide a requested accommodation. Because disabilities are not always apparent, the HA will ensure that all applicants/participants are aware of the opportunity to request reasonable accommodations.
Section II. Applications and Waiting List Management

A. Accepting Applications

1. HA’s waiting list for the Housing Choice Program will remain closed until the HA determines that the number of applicants remaining on the list is insufficient to provide all the applicants needed for the next 12 months. The number needed will be based on the number of vouchers available or expected to become available over the next twelve months, the experience of the HA regarding the number of applicants who are expected to successfully complete the process of establishing their eligibility, and the number of eligible applicants who are expected to successfully lease units under the Housing Program. The HA’s goal is to keep its utilization rate as high as possible.

2. Applications for the Housing Program can be made by mail, telephone, or in person, according to the method described in HA’s advertisement, to HA’s office during the dates advertised. As a reasonable accommodation, even when general applications are accepted only by mail or telephone, applicants with disabilities can apply in person or by telephone on the same days mail applications are accepted.

3. Applicants are placed on the waiting list based on the date and time of receipt of a completed application.

4. Any decision to close the waiting list, or to reopen the waiting list, will be recommended by HA’s Executive Director.

5. At such time as HA determines that the list is to be reopened, public notice of the opening will be made in the local newspaper of general circulation, and through such other media as are determined necessary to reach potentially eligible households not otherwise likely to apply. The public notice will state the dates and times and the method by which applications will be accepted.

B. Establishing the Waiting List

1. All applicants determined eligible will be placed on the waiting list by application number and the preferences, if any, that are claimed.

2. Receipt of all applications will be acknowledged by letter or postcard. The letter will inform the applicant whether, on the basis of the information provided, s/he has been determined eligible for the Housing program.

3. Applicants determined eligible will be advised of their application number and any preferences certified.
4. The letter will further advise applicants that it is their responsibility to notify HA of any change in address or in preference status. If this notice, a preference query, or an appointment letter to the applicant is returned as undeliverable, the applicant will be withdrawn from the waiting list.

5. Applicants determined ineligible will be notified of the reason for the determination and of their right to request an informal hearing to contest the ineligibility determination.

6. If, as a result of the review, the applicant is determined eligible, his/her name will be added to the waiting list in order of application number of the original application.

7. The HA will, from time to time, contact applicants to determine whether they are still interested in receiving Housing assistance and/or to update information on their application. Applicants who fail to respond to such inquiries will be withdrawn from the waiting list.

8. Applicants who are withdrawn from the waiting list for failing to respond to any inquiry from HA will not be reinstated, unless the reason for their failure to respond is verified to be related to their disability.

C. Applicant Selection

1. Notwithstanding an applicant's application number, the HA will select applicants from the waiting list in such a way as to ensure that at least 75% of the applicants admitted to the Housing Choice Voucher Program during any fiscal year are at or below the Extremely Low Income (ELI) limit -- 30% of the median income for the Metropolitan Statistical Area—at the time of admission.

2. This will be accomplished through the use of local preferences based on income tiers:
   - At least 75% of the units leased through the voucher program in any fiscal year shall be provided to families with incomes below 30% of area median income; and
   - Up to 25% of the units leased during the same period may be to families with incomes between 31% and 50% of area median income.

The following families are considered special admissions and or non waiting list admissions:
   - Families requiring relocation from PHA public housing as a result of redevelopment or modernization;
• Families displaced by government action, a formally declared natural disaster, or domestic violence.

3. Within each preference category, applicants will be selected in order of the application number of their application.

4. Single applicants will be selected based on preference.

5. This income tier targeting requirement does not apply to a low-income family that is "continuously assisted" under the 1937 Act, or to a low-income or moderate income family that is displaced as a result of the prepayment of the mortgage or voluntary termination of an insurance contract on project-based eligible low-income housing.

Section III. Eligibility and Verification of Family Circumstances

A. Scheduling the Eligibility Interview

1. When Housing Choice Vouchers become available, eligibility interviews will be scheduled for the applicants at the top of the waiting list.

2. Prior to sending the appointment letter, the HA will check the applicant names against its log of Housing Program reimbursement agreements and the Public Housing accounts payable system to determine whether the applicant has past due balances owed to the HA. No applicant will be admitted to the Housing program who owes money to any HA. A letter will be sent to the applicant advising that the balance must be paid in full. After the balance is paid in full, the applicant can re-apply to the program when the waiting list is opened.

3. Intake appointments for eligibility interviews will be scheduled by letter. The letter will direct the applicant to call for another appointment if the time scheduled is not convenient. If the applicant does not appear for the interview or telephone to request another interview, the applicant’s name will be withdrawn from the waiting list.

4. Applicants with disabilities may request that the interview be conducted in their homes or at some other convenient location if the nature of their disability is such that they cannot reasonably be expected to come to the Housing Program office.

5. The appointment letter will advise the applicant to bring all documents necessary to document their eligibility, family composition, income, citizenship or eligible immigrant status and deductions. Applicants must also be prepared to execute releases so that third party written verifications of information they submit can be obtained.
B. Conducting the Eligibility Interview

1. Applicants will complete an application form, providing all information required on the HUD-50058 and 50059. The application will be signed by all adult members of the household.

2. Applicants will be required to provide third-party documentation of the family composition (e.g. birth certificates, evidence of naturalization, etc.). HA considers that the following qualify as a “family”:
   
   A. Two or more persons (with or without children) regularly living together, related by blood, marriage, adoption, guardianship or operation of law who will live together in HA housing; OR two or more persons who are not so related, but are regularly living together, can verify shared income or resources who will live together in HA housing;
   
   B. The term family also includes: elderly family, near elderly family, disabled family, displaced person, single person, the remaining member of a tenant family, a foster care arrangement, or a kinship care arrangement. Other persons, including members temporarily absent (e.g. a child temporarily placed in foster care or a student temporarily away at college), may be considered a part of the applicant family’s household if they are living or will live regularly with the family (24 CFR §§ 5 and 960);
   
   C. Live-in aides may also be considered part of the applicant family’s household. However, live-in aides are not family members and have no rights of tenancy or continued occupancy;
   
   D. Foster Care Arrangements include situations in which the family is caring for a foster adult, child or children in their home who have been placed there by a public child placement agency, or a foster adult or adults placed in the home by a public adult placement agency;
   
   E. For purposes of continued occupancy: the term family also includes the remaining member of a resident family with the capacity to execute a lease.

3. Single persons who do not otherwise qualify as a family may apply, but will not receive assistance until all single applicants who are elderly, displaced or disabled have been housed.

4. Applicants will be required to provide third party verification of their income using third party verification forms which are to be mailed or
faxed directly from the income source. Or utilize computerized award letters for income received from government sources, such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), court-ordered child support, Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, and Unemployment Compensation. Applicants will sign a release for third party verification of income from employment. The release will be sent to the employer by HA, and the information returned to HA by mail.

5. Applicants who wish to receive deductions for medical expenses, reasonable childcare and/or disability assistance expenses, will be required to provide sources from whom the HA can obtain third-party verification of the expenses.

6. Dependents include persons with disabilities and full-time students other than family head or spouse. Full time students include those attending traditional educational institutions as well as those pursuing full-time vocational training.

C. Determining Eligibility

1. Generally, eligible applicants must verify that their incomes are at or below the Extremely Low-Income limit or the Very Low-Income limit, and that their family does not include an adult who has been involved in violent criminal activity or drug-related criminal activity during the past three years. In addition, any applicant who is on the national register of sexual predators or who has been convicted of manufacture of methamphetamines in assisted housing is ineligible for assistance.

2. As a part of the eligibility determination, HA shall run a criminal record check on all adult family members. When the applicant has lived in Dallas County for the past three years, the record check shall involve the Dallas County Police Department. If any adult member of the applicant family has not lived in Dallas County for the previous three years, records to be checked may include the police department of the localities where the applicant lived as well as the records of the National Crime Information Center. Applicants are required to sign releases for such criminal record checks.

3. Eligibility and income Tiers

No more than 25% of the families admitted in any fiscal year may have incomes that exceed 30% of the median income for the area (Extremely Low Income). Generally, these families may have incomes between 31% and 50% of the area median (Very Low Income). Certain families may, at the time of admission, have incomes between 51% and 80% of the area
median (Low Income) because they do not count against the 25%-75% income targeted requirement. These include:

A. Families continuously assisted in Public Housing or Section 8;
B. Families physically displaced by rental rehabilitation;
C. Non-purchasing tenants of certain homeownership programs;
D. Tenants displaced from certain Section 221 and 236 projects;
E. Low-income families residing in certain HUD-owned projects.

4. At least one member of an eligible family must have either citizenship or eligible immigration status. Applicants will be required to complete a certification of citizenship status for each member of the family. HA will require third party verification of the applicant's certification documentation (i.e., U.S. Passport, resident alien card, social security card or other appropriate documentation. If 62 years of age or older, signed declaration of eligible immigration status and proof of age document.), in accordance with Section 592 of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA).

The HA will not require an applicant to establish and verify eligibility in relation to citizenship before providing financial assistance to an individual or family. However, HA must verify eligibility status no later than the date of the family's annual re-examination.

A pro-rata reduction in housing assistance will be made for all persons in the participant family who do not have either citizenship or eligible immigration status.

5. If, within 30 days of the eligibility interview, the applicant has failed to submit the required documentation or to complete the required forms and certifications, the family will be determined to be ineligible. The applicant will be notified in writing, and will be given the opportunity to request an informal hearing.

6. Families determined eligible to receive assistance will receive a Housing Choice Voucher.

D. Grounds for Denial

The PHA will deny assistance to applicants who:

1. Do not meet any one or more of the eligibility criteria;
2. Fail to complete any aspect of the application or lease-up process;
3. Have any household member with a history of criminal activity occurring within the last 5 years, involving crimes of physical violence against persons or property, and/or other criminal activity including drug-related criminal activity that would adversely affect the health, safety, or well being of other tenants or staff, or cause damage to the property;

4. Have an adult family member who is currently engaged in the illegal use of a drug, or whose pattern of illegal drug use may threaten the health, safety or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents. Or if any household member has ever been convicted of manufacture or production of methamphetamines on the premises of federally assisted housing. Or any household member who is subject to a lifetime registration requirement under a State sex offender registration program;

5. Currently owes rent or other amounts to any housing authority in connection with the public housing or housing programs;

6. Have committed fraud, bribery, or any other corruption in connection with any Federal housing assistance program, including the intentional misrepresentation of information related to their housing application or benefits derived there from;

7. Have a family member who was evicted from public housing within the last five years;

8. Have a family member who was evicted from assisted housing within five years of the projected date of admission because of drug-related criminal activity involving the illegal manufacture, sale, distribution, or possession with the intent to manufacture, sell, distribute a controlled substance as defined in Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802;

9. Have engaged in or threatened abusive or violent behavior towards any HA Housing staff or residents.

E. Informal Hearings

1. When an applicant for Section 8 assistance is determined ineligible for assistance, PHA will notify the applicant in writing. The notice will state the reason for PHA's decision, and that the applicant may request an informal hearing, in writing, within 10 working days of the date of the notice.

2. When an applicant requests an informal hearing, PHA will schedule the hearing promptly and notify the applicant of the time and place that the hearing will be held. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with PHA's procedure on Informal Hearings. The applicant may present his/her case in writing, and may provide additional information to support his/her claim. Within 10 days of the review, PHA will notify the applicant in
writing of its final decision, including a brief statement of the reasons for the final decision.

Section IV. Issuing Housing Choice Vouchers

A. Subsidy Standards

1. Eligible families will be issued Housing Choice Vouchers based on the PHA's subsidy standards. Units shall be occupied by families of the appropriate size.

Minimum and Maximum-Number-of-Persons-Per Unit Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Bedrooms</th>
<th>Min Persons/Unit (Largest Unit Size)</th>
<th>Max Persons/Unit (Smallest Unit Size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0BR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5BR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following principles govern the size of voucher that a family will be issued. Generally, two people are expected to share each bedroom, except that vouchers will be assigned so that:

(a) It will not be necessary for persons of different generations or opposite sex, other than husband and wife, to occupy the same bedroom, although they may do so at the request of the family;

(b) Exceptions to the largest permissible voucher may be made in case of reasonable accommodations for a person with disabilities;

(c) Two children of the opposite sex will not be required to share a bedroom, although they may do so at the request of the family;

(d) An unborn child will not be counted as a person in determining voucher size. A single pregnant woman may be
assigned to a one-bedroom unit. In determining unit size, PHA will count a child who is temporarily away from the home because the child has been placed in foster care, kinship care, or is away at school;

(e) A single head of household parent shall not be required to share a bedroom with his/her child over age five, although they may do so at the request of the family;

(f) A live-in attendant may be assigned a bedroom. Single elderly or disabled residents with live-in attendants will be assigned one or two bedroom units.

2. The Local Housing Code or two persons per bedroom will be used as the standard for the smallest voucher a family may be assigned. The HA must make the case that such occupancy levels will not have the effect of discriminating on the basis of familial status.

3. Other than as a reasonable accommodation for someone with a disability, the largest unit size that a family may be offered would provide no more than one bedroom per family member, taking into account family size and composition.

4. Under the voucher program, the family may select a smaller unit, provided that the unit has at least one living/sleeping room for every two people. The family may also choose to select a larger unit, although they will be subsidized based on the cost of the smallest unit for which they qualify.

B. Issuing Housing Choice Vouchers

1. When all necessary verifications have been received, and HA has determined that the family is eligible to receive a voucher, a notice will be sent to the family advising them of the dates of the next participant briefing sessions. In order to receive a voucher, the applicant must attend one of these sessions. If, at the conclusion of the session, the applicant has not received his/her voucher, and has not contacted PHA to schedule an alternate time for the briefing, the application will be withdrawn.

2. For families headed by persons with disabilities, the participant briefing may be conducted at the applicant's home, or at some other accessible location. Applicants requiring this accommodation must request it at the time they receive the briefing notice.

3. Before receiving a voucher, all applicants are required to attend a briefing session, during which the operation of the program and the responsibilities of the family and the owner will be explained. The briefing
will include an explanation of where a family can live, and how portability works. All families will receive Mobility Counseling explaining the advantages of moving to an area that does not have a high concentration of poor families.

4. All voucher holders will receive a Family Packet, which includes all information required by 24 CFR 982.301 (b).

C. Term of the Housing Choice Voucher

1. Vouchers are issued for an initial term of 60 days.

2. If, at the end of 60 days, the voucher holder has not submitted a Request for Approval of Tenancy (RAT) the voucher will expire unless the family has requested and received approval for an extension. Extensions will be approved only for good cause, including, but not limited to, illness or hospitalization during the initial 60 days, difficulty in locating units suitable for large families or persons with disabilities, or accommodating special needs of the family. Extensions are for 30 days only. A maximum of 2 extensions will be given unless the request for further extension is verified to be related to a disability which has prevented the applicant from using the voucher sooner.

3. The HA will provide a full 120 days for applicants with disabilities to utilize their vouchers to find suitable housing before they will expire. No further extensions will be given except as a reasonable accommodation to an applicant with a verified disability.

4. The HA practices “tolling”, or the suspension of the term of the voucher upon receipt of the RAT. RATs are accepted at any time during the initial 60-day term. If, after the initial or follow-up inspection, the unit is approved, a HAP contract is executed on behalf of the family. If the unit is not approved, consideration will be given as to whether there is sufficient time remaining under the initial term for the family to locate another unit, or whether a 30-day extension is needed.

D. Assistance to Families Subjected to Illegal Discrimination

1. Families who believe that they have been subjected to illegal discrimination during their search for housing are directed to report the occurrence to the PHA. The PHA, in conjunction with the local city or state Fair Housing representatives, will investigate the complaint and take whatever action is determined appropriate.
2. Families who have been determined subjects of illegal discrimination will be eligible to receive an extension to the maximum 120 days.

Section V. Leasing Units

A. Owner Requests for Information

1. The HA shall give each family a statement of the policy on providing information to owners. The statement shall be included in the information packet that is given to a family selected to participate in the program.

2. The HA will inform owners of their responsibility for screening the voucher holders to determine their suitability for tenancy. Factors such as payment of rent and utility bills, care of a leased unit, criminal activity, and respect for the rights of others may be considered.

B. Request for Approval of the Tenancy

1. When the voucher holder finds a unit that is suitable, and the owner has agreed to lease the unit to the family, the family and the owner will complete the Request for Approval of the Tenancy and submit it to HA. The HA will determine whether the unit is within its jurisdiction, and, if so, will schedule a Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection of the unit.

2. The HA may, at its administrative discretion, refuse to enter into a new Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contract with an owner because:

   A. The owner refuses (or has a history of refusing) to evict families for drug related or violent criminal activity, or activity that threatens the health, safety or right of peaceful enjoyment of premises by tenants, HA employees, or owner’s employees, or of residents by neighbors;

   B. The owner has violated obligations under a HAP contract under Section 8 of the 1937 Act;

   C. The owner has committed fraud, bribery or any other corrupt or criminal act in connection with any federal housing program;

   D. The owner has engaged in drug trafficking;

   E. The owner has a history or practice of non-compliance with the UPCS for units leased under the tenant based programs or with applicable housing standards for units leased with project based assistance or leased under any other federal housing program;
F. The owner has not paid State or local real estate taxes, fines or assessments;

G. The owner fails to report that the participant vacated the unit and/or continues to receive housing payments;

H. The owner fails to comply with HA’s Landlord Certification.

3. The HA will not approve a unit owned by a specific owner under the following circumstances:

A. If the PHA has been informed by HUD or otherwise that the owner has been debarred, suspended or subject to a limited denial of participation (24 CFR 24);

B. If directed by HUD because the federal government has instituted an administrative or judicial action against the owner for violation of the Fair Housing Act or other federal equal opportunity requirements, and such action is pending; or

C. If directed by HUD because of a court or administrative agency has determined that the owner violated the Fair Housing Act or other federal equal opportunity requirements.

If the owner is disapproved, notification will be made, including reason, to the owner and the subsidy holder. The owner will be given an opportunity to rectify any deficiencies.

If an owner cannot rectify any deficiencies, the voucher holder will be given a time extension to find a different unit.

C. Housing Types

1. Generally, for inclusion in the voucher program, the unit must have a living room, a kitchen, and a bathroom for the exclusive use of the family, and must be able to be used and maintained without unauthorized use of other private properties.

2. The HA will not approve the use of shared housing, congregate housing, group homes, or single room occupancy units in its voucher program.

D. Rents - Housing Choice Voucher Program

1. Generally, the HA will set its Housing Choice Voucher Payment Standard between 100 and 110% of the HUD-published fair market rent (FMR).
Within those limits, HA may set higher or lower payment standards for certain areas within the jurisdiction as appropriate. The payment standard(s) will be based on information collected by HA regarding rents in each area, and the rent burdens incurred by program participants.

2. A family renting a unit at or below the payment standard pays as gross rent the highest of 30% of the monthly adjusted income, 10% of the monthly gross income, or the established minimum rent. A family renting a unit above the payment standard pays the highest of 30% of the monthly adjusted income, 10% of the monthly gross income, or the established minimum rent, plus any rent above the payment standard.

A family renting a pre-pay unit will be responsible for the greater of the 30% of the monthly adjusted income or the pre-pay amount.

The initial rent for any unit leased under the voucher program must not require that a family pay more that 40% of adjusted income for rent. This maximum initial rent burden (MIRB) is applicable each time a participant moves to a new unit. The rent can exceed the MIRB if the family renews a lease for the same unit.

3. HA requires all participants to pay a minimum rent not less than $25.00 per month rent. If, based on the family's income and expenses, the TTP is calculated to be less than $25.00; PHA will set the family's TTP at $25.00.

4. The HA will not approve for inclusion in the voucher program units whose rents exceed the rents for comparable unassisted units in the market area (rent reasonableness).

The HA will conduct an annual survey of private market rents in its jurisdiction to be used in its determination of rent reasonableness. The survey will include typical contract and gross rents (contract rents plus HA's allowance for tenant-paid utilities, if any) for a representative sample of units of each housing type and size, in each of the areas within its jurisdiction that HA has determined constitutes a distinct market area.

In establishing the reasonable rent for a unit proposed for inclusion in the program, HA will also consider the quality and age of the unit to be leased, and the amenities, housing services, and maintenance provided by the owner.

The process used to determine rent reasonableness will be documented in each tenant file.
E. Unit Inspections

1. The HA or its contractor will inspect each unit for compliance with HUD’s Housing Quality Standards (HQS), as soon as possible, but in no instance later than fifteen calendar days after the receipt of the Request for Approval of Tenancy.

2. All units proposed for inclusion in the Housing program must be in compliance with HQS prior to the beginning of the Housing Assistance Payments Contract (HAP).

3. If the proposed unit does not meet HQS, HA will advise the owner, in writing, what repairs must be made to bring the unit into compliance. The owner will be advised that the repairs must be completed within 30 days, and will be advised of any earlier date by which the repairs must be made to be added to the program rolls for the first of the following month. If the owner is present at the initial inspection, s/he will also be told what repairs must be made, and the time frame in which they must be completed.

4. The HA will schedule re-inspections as soon as possible after the owner notifies the PHA that the work is complete.

5. If the repairs are not made within 30 days, the unit will not be approved for inclusion in the program, and the certificate or voucher holder will be advised to look for another unit.

F. Portability

1. Any applicant family living in a HA’s jurisdiction when applying for the Housing Choice Voucher Program will be permitted to port out when they first receive a voucher, or so long as they are compliant with program requirements, any time they would be permitted to move with continued assistance. If the HA into whose jurisdiction the family moves cannot or will not absorb the porting family, the receiving HA must bill preceding HA for the HAP payment and the approved percentage of the administrative fee.

2. Families who apply for the housing choice voucher program from a location outside of PHA’s jurisdiction must live in PHA’s jurisdiction for one year before they will be eligible to port out.

3. When a family wishes to move into the jurisdiction of PHA with a voucher issued by another housing authority, HA will absorb the participant into the program if there is sufficient budget authority available. If the budget authority is insufficient, HA will administer the unit for the originating housing authority until budget authority is available, at which time the participant will be absorbed into the HA’s program.
Section VI. Annual Functions

A. Re-certification of Family Eligibility

1. At least annually, sixty to ninety days prior to the anniversary date of the HAP contract, participant families will be required to attend a re-certification interview. This interview to advises PHA of any changes in the family's size or circumstances, and documentation is resubmitted to PHA regarding the family's income and allowable deductions. Any change in the family's payment that results from this reexamination will become effective on the anniversary date of the HAP contract.

2. An interim re-examination shall occur when there is a change in family composition and/or at least a 15% change in gross monthly income and/or change in income sources(s). A reduction in benefits caused by the families' non-compliance will not reduce the families' share of rent.

3. Families whose income decreases may request an interim re-certification any time during the year. Once verified by PHA, the change in the family's payment resulting from the decrease in income will be effective the first of the month following the participant's notification to PHA.

4. A family's rent will not be decreased as a result of a reduction in welfare benefits based on welfare fraud by a member of the family. Nor as a result of the family's failure to comply with the welfare program requirements for work activities or participation in an economic self-sufficiency program if verified by the welfare agency. If a reduction in welfare income results from the expiration of a lifetime limit on benefits or a loss of benefits because of a lengthy time limit on welfare benefits despite compliance, PHA will reflect the reduced income in determining the family's annual income.

5. If the annual re-examination results in a zero HAP, the family may continue as a program participant for six months from the date of the re-examination effective date. During that period, the HAP contract between the HA and the owner remains in effect. If the family circumstances change during the six month period, and the family again needs assistance, the HA will conduct an interim re-examination and reinstate assistance. At the end of six months, if the subsidy has not been restored, the HAP contract will terminate. The HA must provide the family and the owners at least 30 days advance notification of the proposed termination and an opportunity to request an informal hearing.
B. Annual Inspection of Units

1. At least once a year, prior to the anniversary date of the HAP contract, HA will conduct an inspection of each assisted unit. If PHA determines that the unit is not in compliance with inspection standards, notice will be sent to the owner advising him/her of the repairs needed. 30 days will generally be allowed for the owner to make the repairs, except for repairs needed to correct a condition determined by PHA to be life-threatening, which must be made within 24 hours. PHA will re-inspect the unit after the time allowed, or at such earlier time as the owner notifies PHA that the repairs have been made. If the repairs have not been made after 30 days, the HAP payment will be abated until the repairs are made or until the anniversary date of the contract. If repairs are not made by the anniversary date of the HAP contract, the HAP contract will be terminated and the family advised to look for another unit.

2. No retroactive payment will be made for the period after the first 30 days during which the unit was not in compliance with HQS.

3. HA will bar owners from future participation in the Housing program who have three units abated or terminated for non-compliance with HQS.

4. If the unit fails HQS for reasons attributable to the family's care or use of the unit, the family will receive written notification of the actions to be taken and a copy of the notice will be sent to the owner. Such failure may occur when the family fails to pay for utilities that are to be paid by the family, fails to provide or to maintain in working order any appliances that are provided by the family, or when a member or guest of the family causes damages to the unit beyond normal wear and tear. The family will be given 30 days to correct the defect or 24 hours if the resulting condition is determined by PHA to be life threatening. If the defect is not corrected by the family during the time allowed, the HAP contract and the family’s participation in the program will be terminated.

5. The family or the owner may request an inspection at any time during the year if a deficiency exists and if efforts to have the deficiency corrected by the responsible party—owner or family—have failed. The inspection and PHA's follow-up will be handled as described in B 2 and B 4, above.
C. Rent Increases

1. The owner may request a rent increase at any time that an increase is allowed under the lease. This request must be in writing. PHA's approval of the increase will be subject to its determination that the resulting rent will not exceed rents for comparable unassisted units in the market area (rent reasonableness). At no time during the assisted tenancy will the rent to the owner exceed the reasonable rent as determined by PHA.

Section VII. Changes in Family Size, Family Separations, Absences, and Moves

A. Changes in Family Size

1. If the family size increases while the family is receiving assistance under the voucher program, and the family becomes eligible for a larger unit, at the anniversary date of the current HAP Contract, HA will issue the larger voucher at the family's request.

2. If the increase in family size results in the assisted unit failing HQS space standards, PHA will issue the larger certificate or voucher at the family's request, but in any case no later than the anniversary date of the current HAP contract, and the family will be required to find a larger unit. The HAP contract for an overcrowded unit will be terminated as of the anniversary date of the contract.

3. If the family size decreases while the family is receiving assistance under the voucher program, and the family becomes ineligible for the unit size it currently occupies, HA will issue the smaller voucher. The participant can remain in the unit as long as the Total Tenant Payment does not exceed 40% of the monthly adjusted income. However, if the Total Tenant Payment does exceed 40% of the adjusted income, the voucher will be down graded and the family will be required to relocate or voucher will be terminated.

4. If the HA proposes to terminate a HAP contract under the provisions of Section VII A. (2) or (3), it will notify the family of allowable exceptions to the HA's occupancy standard (i.e., age, health, or handicap of an elderly or disabled family member), as well as the process by which the family can request an exception.

5. HA will not terminate a HAP contract under the provisions of Section VII A. (3) above if it has determined that there is no acceptable unit available for rent by the family in the jurisdiction of PHA.
B. Family Separations

If a family separates while it is receiving Housing assistance, HA will determine who retains the assistance as follows:

1. First consideration will be given to a family member forced to leave the household as a result of actual or threatened violence by a spouse or other family member;
2. Second consideration will be given to an adult family member with custody of minor children;
3. Third consideration will be given to an adult family member with custody of ill, elderly, or disabled family members; and
4. If none of the above apply, the adult member initially designated as head of household will retain the Section 8 assistance.

C. Family Absences from the Assisted Unit

1. An assisted family that finds it necessary to be absent from the unit for a more than 30 consecutive days is required to notify the owner and HA of their absence, and the date by which they expect to return. During the family’s absence, if the unit will be occupied by a caretaker not considered a part of the household, the tenant must secure the owner’s permission for the arrangement, and notify HA. If HA finds the assisted unit unoccupied, or occupied by someone other than the designated head of household or other adult member of the family, it will assume that the family has vacated the unit and will terminate the HAP contract.

2. Under no circumstances may the family be absent from the assisted unit for more than 180 consecutive days. If the family’s absence exceeds 180 days, HA will terminate the HAP contract.

3. If the family has given the notice required in C 1, above, the family will be eligible to receive a new voucher within 180 days of the termination of the HAP contract if assistance is available under the voucher program. For purposes of determining eligibility, these families will be considered as having been continuously assisted under the 1937 Act, and the very-low income limitation will not apply.

4. If the required notice has not been given, or if more than 180 days have elapsed since the termination of the HAP contract, the family will not be eligible to resume assistance, and must reapply when applications are being accepted.
D. Family Moves with Continued Assistance

1. An assisted family in good standing may move to a new unit at any time with continued assistance if: the HAP for the old unit has been terminated due to the owner's breach; the tenant has given the owner notice consistent with the terms of the lease; or if there is a mutual agreement between the owner and the family that the lease can be terminated.

2. The HA does not limit when or how often an assisted family may move under the conditions described in D 1, above.

3. Amounts paid for vacancy loss, tenant damages, and/or unpaid rent under an old form of the HAP contract must be repaid by the family prior to HA's issuance of a new voucher.

4. Assistance will be terminated and the family will not be able to move to a new unit with continued assistance if: the owner has evicted the tenant for serious or repeated violation of the lease for criminal activity in or around the assisted unit; or if the HAP has been terminated because of the tenant's failure to meet his/her family obligations under the Housing program.

Section VIII  Evictions and Owner Claims

A. Evictions

1. An owner may evict a Housing Program tenant at any time for: serious or repeated violations of the lease; violation of local, State, or federal laws applicable to the tenant's occupancy of the unit; violent criminal behavior by the tenant, a household member, or guest that threatens other residents or persons residing near the unit; or drug-related criminal activity.

2. After the first year, an owner may give notice of lease termination to a Housing Program tenant for other good cause, including: unwillingness by the family to accept a new lease or revision to the lease; the owner's desire to use the unit for personal or family use, or for a purpose other than as a residential unit; or a business or economic reason for termination of the tenancy.

3. The owner must give the tenant a written notice of intention to terminate the lease, and the grounds for the termination, and must give a copy to the HA. If the lease is being terminated for business or economic reasons, the owner is required to give the tenant 90 days notice.
4. A Housing Program tenant who is evicted for: serious or repeated violations of the lease; violation of local, State, or federal laws applicable to the tenant’s occupancy of the unit; violent criminal behavior by the tenant, a household member, or guest that threatens other residents or persons residing near the unit; or drug-related criminal activity, will have his/her assistance terminated and will not be eligible to move to a new unit with Section 8 assistance.

B. Owner Claims

1. If the owner of a unit leased under a HAP contract providing for such payments files a claim for vacancy loss, tenant damages, and/or unpaid rent, the HA will review the claim and determine the amount payable. Prior to making the payment, the HA will give the family an opportunity to review the HA’s calculations and the owner’s claim, and present arguments why all or part of the claim should not be paid. Such arguments might include: proof of timely notice to the owner of the family’s intent to move, and/or the owner’s agreement to allow the family to move; proof that items claimed as tenant damage were defective at move-in or were the result of the owner’s negligence; or proof that disputed rent payments were made. The HA will evaluate the family’s claims, and calculate the amount, if any, to be paid to the owner.

2. The family will be required to enter into a repayment agreement with the PHA for amounts paid to the owner for vacancy loss, tenant damages, or unpaid rent. The standard payment under a repayment agreement will be ten percent of the family’s adjusted monthly income. This amount can be modified by the HA if the family demonstrates to the satisfaction of the HA that it is not able to pay that amount.

3. If the family refuses to enter into a repayment agreement, or fails to make three consecutive payments of the amount agreed to by the PHA under an existing repayment agreement, the family’s participation in the Housing program will be terminated.

Section IX. Terminusions and Informal Hearings

A. Terminations

1. The HA will permanently terminate assistance to Housing Program participants who:

   • are required to register under a State Sex Offender Registration Program;
2. HA will terminate assistance to Housing Program participants for a period of five years for the following violations:

- any member of the family has engaged in drug related criminal activity, or violent criminal activity as defined in 24 CFR, 982;
- have an adult family member who is currently engaged in the illegal use of drugs or whose pattern of illegal drug use may threaten the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents;
- any member of the family commits fraud, bribery, or any other corruption in connection with any Federal Housing Program;
- the family subleases their unit, (a promissory note will be issued to recoup paid rent);
- the family own or has interest in the unit;
- a member of the family has been evicted from federal assisted housing in the last 5 years;
- a participant engages in or threatens abusive or violent behavior towards any HA staff or resident.

3. HA will terminate assistance to Housing Program participants until the next open enrollment with the understanding that they have met all obligations for the following violations:

- The family violates any family obligations under the Housing Choice Voucher Program;
- The family fails to make three consecutive payments under an existing repayment agreement with any housing agency;
- The family abandons their unit without giving notice;
- A family member has a pattern of abuse of alcohol and/or drugs that threaten the health, safety, or right to the peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents;
- Any family member fails to sign and submit consent forms required for obtaining information on family status.
• Any family member fails to declare citizenship or provide documentation of eligible non-citizen status within the prescribed time frame;
• The family is evicted from housing assisted under the program for a serious or repeated violation of the lease;

B. Informal Hearings

1. The HA will provide the opportunity for an informal hearing to program participants who are being terminated from the program. The HA will send written notice of the reason(s) for the proposed action, and advise the participant that if he/she does not agree with the decision, he/she may request an informal hearing in writing, within 10 working days of the notice. If the participant requests a hearing, the assistance will not be terminated until the final decision is made.

2. When a participant requests a hearing, the HA will schedule the hearing promptly and notify the participant of the date and time of the hearing. Prior to the hearing, the participant will be given an opportunity to examine and copy any documents pertinent to the family’s termination.

3. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the HA’s Informal Hearing Procedure. The family may be represented by a lawyer or other representative at its own expense. The family will be given the opportunity to present evidence, and to question any witness. The hearing officer will issue a written decision within 10 working days, stating the reasons for the decision.

4. An informal hearing will also be provided for participants who believe that their annual or adjusted income, utility allowance, or allowable unit size has not been determined in accordance with the law, HUD regulations, or the HA’s policies. These participants will first be given an explanation of the basis for the HA’s determination. If the family still does not agree with the determination, an informal hearing will be scheduled as above.

Section X. Program Management

A. Leasing Units

1. The HA will take all actions necessary to reach and maintain a utilization rate of at least 95%.

2. The HA will prepare a monthly report showing the number of certificate and voucher units under lease, and the number of certificates and vouchers outstanding by race, ethnicity, age and disability of applicants and participants.
B. Revising Utility Allowance Schedules

1. At least annually, the HA will obtain and analyze utility rate data for all utility providers in the local jurisdiction, and will determine whether there has been a change of 10% or more in the rate for any utility since the last revision of the Utility Allowance Schedule.

2. If there has been a change of 10% or more, an appropriate adjustment to the schedule will be made. No adjustment will be made for any increase calculated to be less than $1 per unit month.

C. Revising Voucher Payment Standards

1. At least annually, the HA will determine whether the payment standard is adequate to allow families to find housing. The PHA will analyze data on current voucher program participants, and will determine whether the number of voucher program participants paying more than 40% of their Adjusted Gross Income for rent and utilities is significant.

2. If HA determines that a significant number of voucher program participants are paying more than 40%, data on the rent and utility cost of units in the market area will also be examined to determine whether there is an adequate supply of rental units of all sizes available at or below the payment standard families who do not choose to accept an excessive rent burden.

3. The payment standard for each unit size will be set at a level adequate to allow families to lease units under the voucher program. However, under no circumstances will the voucher payment standard be set at less than 100% or more than 110% of the published Fair Market Rent without HUD approval, unless the reason for the increase is based on increased cost of utilities, in which case the payment standard may be raised to 120% of FMR without HUD approval.

D. Administrative Fee Reserve

1. The HA maintains an administrative fee reserve for the Housing program. the HA credits to the administrative fee reserve the total of:
   - The amount by which program administrative fees paid by HUD for a fiscal year exceed PHA’s program expenses for the fiscal year, plus
   - Interest earned on the administrative fee reserve.
2. If funds in the administrative fee reserve are not needed to cover the HA's Housing Program administrative expenses, HA may use these funds for other housing purposes permitted by State and local law. However, HUD may prohibit use of the funds for certain purposes.

E. Fraud Recovery

If the HA determines that the family committed willful and intentional fraud, the HA will require the family to repay the entire amount in full or have assistance terminated. If the family's assistance is terminated and the repayment has not been made, the money will still be owed and the HA will take action to collect the amounts owed.

Before taking action against a family for any perceived fraud, the HA will carefully review documentation and calculations to ensure there are no errors.

If the HA determines that there was no willful intent to defraud and/or the family willingly supplied information regarding a violation, the HA will enter into a Repayment Agreement with the family while the family remains a participant in the program.

1. Rescheduling Repayment agreement
   - If the financial status of a participant changes for the worse and the HA is notified, the HA will change the schedule of the repayment agreement
   - After three delinquent payments, the account will go into default and payment will be required, in full.
   - If the family has defaulted on a previous repayment agreement, the HA may: execute another Repayment Agreement combining all amounts owed; require payment in full of all other outstanding debts prior to executing another Repayment Agreement; require payment in full of all debts owed to the HA; and process termination in addition to collecting the amounts owed. Determination regarding the execution of additional Repayment Agreements will be based on the family's history of repayment and willingness to satisfy the debt.

2. Certification of Repayment Agreement, Deposits, and Requirements for Administrative Fee Retention.
   - HA staff will certify each case to determine if the participant intentionally committed fraud.
   - The HA must be the principal party initiating the action to recovery funds from the family in order to retain any portion of the recovery.
• The HA will retain 50% of the fraud recovery amount, actually collected, less any HUD expenses related to the fraud recovery.
• A copy of the Repayment Agreement form, the HA’s Recovery Report, and a cashier’s check or money order will be submitted to Financial Administration at which point, the Financial Administration will determine the appropriate account.

3. Repayment agreement
• The payment amount is to be determined by calculating 10% of the family’s most recent adjusted monthly household income. Exceptions are approved by the Housing Supervisor;
• The first payment will be due within 30 to 45 days. The participant can decide on the payment date.
• Payments are to be made payable to Dallas County Department of Health and Human Services.
• Payments are to be submitted to the HA’s Program Monitor.

Section XI. Family Self Sufficiency Program Financial Management

The HA will establish and maintain an escrow account that accrues funds for participants of the FSS Program. The HA will credit the applicable portion of the family’s rent to the escrow account on a monthly basis. A statement containing the cumulative FSS contribution amounts, including interest earned on the amount (as provided by the Dallas County Auditors Office), will be issued to each participant on an annual basis. The amount of a participant’s FSS accrued funds will be disbursed upon completion of program objectives. FSS funds in a participant’s account may be forfeited if the HA determines that the “Contract of Participation” is violated in any manner or terminated due to reasons specified in the contract. FSS forfeited funds will be credited to the housing assistance payment budget.

Section XII. Home Ownership Program Financial Management

The HA will establish and maintain an escrow account to facilitate housing mortgage payments for clients in the program. The housing assistance payment will be credited to the escrow accounts each month. The funds will be disbursed to the lender as necessary.
Section XIII. Expanding Housing Opportunities Through Mobility Counseling

A. Housing Opportunities

The HA is committed to providing its housing participants with the broadest possible range of housing choices. Actions to be taken will include:

1. Providing a thorough explanation to voucher holders of where they can move, using maps showing the various areas in and outside of HA’s jurisdiction, and the location of key facilities and services. Discussing the advantages of living outside areas of low-income concentration;

2. Providing a thorough explanation of portability under the Housing program, and including in the packet a listing of the names and phone numbers of contact persons at neighboring housing authorities;

3. Providing certificate and voucher holders and participants who wish to move with listings of units throughout Dallas County currently available for housing participants, and of owners and organizations operating outside of areas of low-income concentration;

4. Recruiting landlords in neighborhoods of the county where there are low concentrations of minorities and persons of low income;

5. Evaluating the need for, and seeking HUD approval if necessary, for payment standards exceeding 110% of the published Fair Market Rent for areas with lower concentrations of low-income families (applying for sub-market fair market rents); and

6. Conducting outreach to owners of rental housing in Dallas County and surrounding jurisdictions in areas with lower concentrations of low-income families. Outreach efforts will include periodic advertisements in the newspaper of general circulation, semi-annual meetings with current and potential owners, and the distribution to owners of informational materials about the Housing program.
Section XIV. Definitions

**Absorption** - In portability, the point at which a receiving HA stops billing the initial HA for assistance on behalf of a portability family. The receiving HA uses funds available under the receiving HA consolidated ACC.

**Administrative plan** - A document that describes the HA policies for administration of the tenant-based program.

**Admission** - The effective date of the first HAP contract for a family (first day of initial lease term) in a tenant-based program. This is the point when the family becomes a participant in the program.

**Applicant (applicant family)** - A family that has applied for admission to a program, but is not yet a participant in the program.

**Citizen** - Citizen/national of the United States.

**Contiguous MSA** - In portability, an MSA that shares a common boundary with the MSA in which the jurisdiction of the initial HA is located.

**Continuously assisted** - An applicant is continuously addicted under the 1937 Housing Act if the family is already receiving assistance under any 1937 Housing Act program when the family is admitted to the voucher program.

**Disabled person** – One who is under a disability as specified in Section 223 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423) or in Section 102(b)(5) of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities construction Amendments of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 6001(7)). (Any family member who is disabled qualifies that family as a disabled family.)

**Displaced person** – One who is displaced by governmental action, or one whose dwelling has been extensively damaged or destroyed as a result of a disaster declared or otherwise formally recognized pursuant to Federal Disaster Relief Laws.

**Drug-related criminal activity** – Term means: (1) Drug-trafficking; or (2) Illegal use, or possession for personal use, or a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

**Drug-trafficking** - The illegal manufacture, sale or distribution, or the possession with intent to manufacture, sell or distribute, or a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

**Elderly person** - A person who is at least 62 years of age.
**Fair market rent (FMR)** - The rent including the cost of utilities (except for telephone), that would be required to be paid in the housing market area to obtain privately owned, existing, decent, safe and sanitary rental housing of modest (non-luxury) nature with suitable amenities. FMR for existing housing are established by HUD for housing units of varying sizes (number of bedrooms), and are published in the **Federal Register** in accordance with 24 CFR part 888.

**Family** - One or more persons who share goals and values, have commitments to one another, and reside usually in the same place. (1) A “family” may be a single person or a group of persons. (2) A “family” includes a family with a child or children. (3) A group of persons consisting of two or more elderly persons or disabled persons living together, or one or more elderly or disabled persons living with one or more live-in aides is a family. (4) A single person family may be(i) an elderly person, (ii) a displaced person, (iii) a disable person and, (iv) any other single person. (5) A child who is temporarily away from the home because of placement in foster care is considered a member of the family.

**Family Unit Size** - The appropriate number of bedrooms for a family.

**FMR** – Fair market rent

**HA** - Housing Agency

**HAP contract** - Housing assistance payments contract.

**Housing Agency (HA)** - A state, county, municipality or other governmental entity or public body authorized to engage in or assist in the development or operation of low-income housing.

**Housing Assistance Payment (HAP)** - The monthly assistance payment by an HA. The total assistance payment consists of: (1) a payment to the owner for rent to owner under the family’s lease. (2) An additional payment to the family if the total assistance payment exceeds the rent to owner. In the certification program, the additional payment is called a “utility reimbursement”.

**Housing Assistance Payments contract (HAP Contract)** - A written contract between an HA and an owner, in the form prescribed by HUD headquarters, in which the HA agrees to make housing assistance payment to the owner on behalf of an eligible family.

**Housing Quality Standards (HQS)** - The HUD minimum quality standards for housing assisted under the tenant-based programs.

**HUD** - The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

**HUD requirements** - HUD requirements for the Housing Choice Voucher programs. HUD requirements are issued by HUD headquarters, as regulations,
Federal Register notices or other binding program directive.

Initial contract rent- The contract rent at the beginning of the initial lease term

Initial lease term - The initial term of the assisted lease. The initial term must be for at least one year.

Initial rent to owner- The rent to owner at the beginning of the initial lease term

Jurisdiction- The area in which the HA has authority under State and local law to administer the program.

Lease - A written agreement between an owner and a tenant for the leasing of a dwelling unit to the tenant. The lease establishes the conditions for occupancy of the dwelling unit by a family with housing assistance payment under a HAP Contract between and the HA.

Lease addendum- An addition to the lease between the tenant and the owner, the lease language by HUD.

1937 Housing Act program- Any of the following programs:
   (1) The public housing program or Indian housing program
   (2) Any program assisted under Section8 of the 1937 Act including assistance under a Section 8 tenant-based or project-based program.
   (3) The Section 23 leased housing and housing assistance programs.

Noncitizen- A person who is neither a citizen nor a national of the United States

Owner- Any person or entity with the legal right to lease or sublease a unit to a participant.

Participant (participant family) - A family that has been admitted to the HA program, and is currently assisted in the program. The family becomes a participant on the effective date of the first HAP contract executed by the HA for the family.

Payment standard - In the voucher program, an amount used by the HA to calculate the housing assistance payment for a family. Each payment standard amount is based on the fair market rent. The payment standard is the maximum monthly subsidy payment.

PHA - Public housing agency (Public housing agency and housing agency mean the same thing.)

Portability- Renting a dwelling unit with Housing Choice tenant-based assistance outside the jurisdiction of the initial HA
Premises- The building or complex in which the dwelling unit is located, including common areas and grounds.

Program- The Housing Choice Voucher Program

Reasonable rent- A rent to owner that is not more than either: (1) rent charged for comparable units in the private unassisted market; or (2) rent charged by the owner for a comparable assisted or unassisted unit in the building or premises.

Receiving HA- In portability, an HA that receives a family selected for participation in the tenant-based program of another HA. The receiving HA issues a certificate or voucher, and provides program assistance to the family.

Rent to owner- The monthly rent payable to the owner under the lease. Rent to owner includes payment for any services, maintenance and utilities to be provided by the owner includes payment for any services, maintenance and utilities to be provided by the owner in accordance with the lease.

Special admission- Admission of an applicant that is not on the HA waiting list, or without considering the applicant's waiting list position.

Suspension- Stopping the clock on the term of a family's certificate or voucher, for such period as determined by the HA, from the time when the family submits a request for HA approval to lease a unit, until the time when the HA approves or denies the request.

Tenant- The person or persons (other than a live-in aide) who execute the lease as lessee of the dwelling unit

Tenant rent- The amount of rent to be paid by the tenant

Unit- Dwelling unit

Utility reimbursement- The amount, if any, by which any utility allowance for family-paid utilities or other housing services exceeds the total tenant payment.

Violent criminal activity- Any illegal criminal activity that has as one of its elements the use, attempted use, or threatened use pf physical force against the person or property of another

Voucher (rental voucher) - A document issued by an HA to a family selected for admission to the voucher program. The voucher describes the program and the procedures for HA approval of a unit selected by the family. The voucher also states the obligations of the family under the program.
Voucher holder- A family holding a voucher with unexpired search time.

Voucher program- Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Waiting list admission- An admission from the HA waiting list.
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Landlord Briefing Packet

Housing Choice Voucher Existing Program

Dallas County Housing Agency Responsibilities

Owner Responsibilities

Family Responsibilities

Eligible and Ineligible types of Housing

Housing Quality Standards Inspections

Rent Reasonableness

Contractual Relationships in the Housing Choice Voucher Program (Chart)

When Assistance is paid by DCHA

Steps to Leasing Property on DCHA Housing Choice Voucher Program

Fair Market Rents and Payment Standards

Area of Jurisdiction

Housing Voucher (Sample)

Housing Assistance Payments Contracts (Sample)
  • Voucher Program

Lease Addendum (HUD-52535.3) (Sample)

Lease Addendum (Drug Free) (Sample)

Inspection Form (HUD-52580-A) (Sample)

Request for Lease Approval (Sample)

Landlord Packet (Sample)
Exhibit a (con’t)

Utility Schedule (Sample)

Fair Housing Booklet
### Exhibits B

#### Income Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Family</th>
<th>Maximum Annual Income Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Lower Income - $37,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $23,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower Income - $42,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $26,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lower Income - $47,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $29,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lower Income- $53,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $33,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Income- $57,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $35,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lower Income- $61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $38,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lower Income- $65,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $41,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low Income- $70,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income- $43,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit C

Briefing Package Contents

1. Voucher
   How to obtain an extension on Rental Voucher
2. How the Housing Assistance Payment is computed
3. How to determine the Maximum Rent on a unit
4. Factors every family should consider when leasing a unit
5. Information on Portability
6. HUD lease Addendum
7. What information about family will be shared with Landlord
8. Fair Market Rent and Subsidy Standards
9. Request for Lease Approval with attachments
10. HUD Brochure – How to select a unit
11. Lead-Based Paint Notice
12. Information on Fair Housing
    HUD Form 903, Housing Discrimination Complaint
    HUD Form 1260-FHEO (2), Fair Housing, Its Your Right
13. Landlords List
    List of HUD assisted properties
    List of Rental Properties
14. List of Accessible Units
15. Family Obligation Under the Program
16. Termination of Family Assistance
17. Informal Hearing Procedures
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Robbie Placino, Senior Buyer
SUBJECT: Annual Contract for Purchase of Clothing and Apparel: Bid# 2002-099-1125

Background/Issue
On May 28, 2002, the Commissioners Court awarded the aforementioned contract to GoldWater Industries, Inc.; Care Free Uniforms, Inc; National Textile and Apparel, Inc; and Walter F. Stephens, Jr. Inc. for the period of May 28, 2002 through May 27, 2003. The contract provides clothing and apparel to various County Jail facilities. In accordance with the contract terms and upon mutual agreement, the contract may be extended for two twelve-month periods based on the existing terms, conditions and pricing set forth. As a result of the mentioned vendors' compliance with the contract specifications, the Sheriff's Department requests that the County exercise the first twelve-month extension option contained within Bid # 2002-099-1125.

GoldWater Industries, Inc.; Care Free Uniforms, Inc; National Textile and Apparel, Inc; and Walter F. Stephens, Jr. Inc. have agreed to extend Bid# 2002-099-1125 for a first twelve-month period in accordance with the contract prices, terms and conditions.

Financial Impact
Dallas County currently incurs expenditures of $175,851.74 per year for Clothing and Apparel in accordance with the terms and conditions outlined in Bid# 2002-099-1125.

Recommendation
In accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Bid# 2002-099-1125, the Purchasing Department recommends that the Annual Contract for Purchase of Clothing and Apparel, be extended for an additional twelve month period as awarded to GoldWater Industries, Inc; Care Free Uniforms, Inc.; National Textile and Apparel, Inc. and Walter F. Stephens, Jr. Inc. beginning May 28, 2003 through May 27, 2004 at an estimated cost of $175,851.74.

Should the Court concur with this recommendation, a Court Order will be scheduled for the next available Formal Agenda.

Recommended for Approval by:

Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director
May 20, 2003

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Linda Boles, Purchasing Supervisor
SUBJECT: Annual Contract for Disposal of Hazardous Waste, Bid #2001-103-839

Background/Issue
On June 18, 2003, the Commissioners Court authorized a twelve month extension to the aforementioned contract as awarded to Teris, LLC for the period of June 19, 2002 through June 18, 2003. The contract provides a fixed rate cost for disposal services related to hazardous waste accumulated and collected by various County Departments based on an as needed basis. In addition, the contract terms permit (upon mutual agreement) the contract to be extended for a final twelve month period based on the terms, conditions and pricing set forth and awarded. As a result of Teris, LLC.’s compliance with contract specifications, the Institute of Forensic Sciences (Contract Manager) has requested that the County exercise the final twelve month extension option contained within Bid #2001-103-839.

Teris L.L.C. has agreed to extend the contract for an additional twelve month period in accordance with the terms, conditions and pricing set forth in Bid #2001-103-839. Teris L.L.C.’s contract pricing reflects a cost savings of approximately 45% when compared to the remaining bidder’s proposals. Historically, Dallas County has experienced increases in hazardous waste disposal services due to re-solicitation of this type of contract. Therefore, the extension is recommended.

Insurance and M/WBE (EEO1) Compliance
Teris has current insurance certificate coverage that complies with the contract requirements set forth for Bid #2001-103-839. In addition, attached for the Commissioners review is the company’s current EEO1 form.

Financial Impact
To date, Dallas County payment records indicate expenditures of approximately $18,300.00 for hazardous waste disposal services in connection with the specifications outlined in Bid #2001-103-839.

Recommendation
In accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Bid #2001103-839, the Purchasing Department recommends that the Annual Contract for Hazardous Waste Disposal as awarded to Teris L.L.C be extended for the final twelve month period based on the terms and conditions set forth, effective June 19, 2003 through June 18, 2004.

Should the Court concur with this recommendation, a Court Order will be scheduled for the next available Formal Agenda.

Recommended for Approval by:

[Signature]
Philip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director
May 13, 2003

Linda Boles
Purchasing Supervisor
Dallas County
Purchasing Department

FAX # 214-653-7449

Dear Ms. Boles:

Attached you will find Teris' completed EEO1 form for 2002. Teris also agrees to extend the annual contract for disposal of hazardous waste, Bid #2001-103-839 with the pricing remaining the same.

If you have any questions, or need further information please feel free to contact me via email at kshoemaker@terisna.com or at (870) 864-3711.

Sincerely,

Kathy Shoemaker
Technical Proposal Coordinator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER.</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Sem Skilled)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER.</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Sem Skilled)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHECK ONE:**
- Minority-Owned Firm Certification #
- Women-Owned Firm Certification #
- Non-Minority Owned Firm

**Issued by:**

**Signature/Date:**

**Typed Name and Title:**

Richard Mestwell
Human Resource Manager
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Linda Boles, Purchasing Supervisor
SUBJECT: RFP for Licensee for Vending Operations at Various County Facilities

Background/Issue
By authorization of the Commissioners Court, proposals were received and opened for the aforementioned request for proposal. The proposal seeks solicitations from firms to provide non-exclusive license rights for vending machine operations in various licensed county facilities based on a commission percentage from the gross retail sales of merchandise sold. The contract is based on a five year agreement to provide a minimum of sixty vending machines of various types and locations as designated by Dallas County for the purpose of providing vending operations to the employees, jurors and visitors at the various designated sites. The rating criteria and points assigned are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points Allotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Revenue Generation</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. References/Time Factors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Menu Selection &amp; Pricing</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. M/WBE Compliance and Participation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five (5) firms responded with proposals for this contract. They are as follows:
1. M-C Vending Co., Inc.
2. Ameritex Vending Co.
3. Adolph’s Vending Service
4. Custom Food Group
5. Compass Group (Canteen Vending)

The proposals were evaluated and scored by representatives from the following county departments; Facilities Management, Auditor and Purchasing. The M/WBE Officer solely reviewed and scored Category IV: M/WBE Participation. The scoring chart reflecting each representative’s score is attached.

Consolidated scores reflect M-C Vending Co. as the highest rated proposer. A caption of the consolidated scores is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. M-C Vending Co., Inc.</td>
<td>87.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adolph’s Vending Service</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ameritex Vending Co.</td>
<td>76.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Custom Food Group</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compass Group (Canteen)</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the attached score sheet, M-C Vending received the highest score in three of the four available categories. Category II (References/Time Factors) reflected that M-C Vending clearly has the ability to provide adequate service and equipment to satisfactorily manage the County’s contract for vending operations and without any disruption to current service. Category III (Menu/Pricing) reflects that M-C Vending offered the largest menu selection of all the companies. In addition, their pricing structure (when comparing equal items) was relatively consistent to that of the remaining companies. An analysis furnished by the M/WBE Coordinator reflects that three of the five companies (M-C Vending, Custom Food Group
and Compass Group) scored three (3) points for EEO1 compliance requirements. While Ameritex and Adolph's Vending Services both received (3) points for being EEO1 compliance and six (6) points for either being a Certified M/WBE company or utilizing a certified M/WBE firm.

Financial Impact
Scoring for Category I (Revenue generation) was derived from a recent Auditor's report that shows gross merchandise sales of approximately $420,000.00 (10/00 - 9/01). The sales volume is based on revenues received from the placement of approximately 90 machines throughout Dallas County (including jails). As a result, taking into consideration possible additions/deletions of machines, staff estimated revenues utilizing the same projected gross sales for the five year contract period are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total 5 yr. Revenue Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. M-C Vending Co., Inc.</td>
<td>$619,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ameritex Vending</td>
<td>$598,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adolph’s Vending</td>
<td>$593,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Custom Food Group</td>
<td>$577,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compass Group (Canteen)</td>
<td>$ 90,000.00 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*(proposal is based on guaranteed $7,500/month w/ no alternative commission percentage offered.)*

It should be noted that unless volume sales drop below $305,084/year, M-C Vending’s 29.5% revenue would provide Dallas County with the highest revenue return.

Recommendation
M-C Vending, current contractor, offered the highest revenues, best menu and comparable pricing when compared to the remaining proposals received. As a result, it is the recommendation of the review committee to award RFP #2003-068-1307 (Licensee for Vending Operations at Various County Buildings) to M-C Vending Co., Inc. based on a commission percentage of 29.5% from the gross retail sales of merchandise sold, effective June 1, 2003 through May 31, 2008.

Should the Court concur with this recommendation an award Court Order will be scheduled for the next available Court session.

Recommended for Approval by:

[Signature]
Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director

C: Dempsey Tarver, Auditor
   Jim Barrett, Assistant Facilities Manager
   Kern Sandford, Contract Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Pts.</th>
<th>PROPOSER #1 M-C VENDING CO., INC.</th>
<th>PROPOSER #2 AMERITEX VENDING CO.</th>
<th>PROPOSER #3 ADOLPHS VENDING SVC</th>
<th>PROPOSER #4 CUSTOM FOOD GROUP</th>
<th>PROPOSER #5 COMPASS GROUP (CANTEEN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. REVENUE GENERATION</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL CATEGORY I</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal divided by 3:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REFERENCES/TIME FACTORS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL CATEGORY II</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal divided by 3:</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. MENU SELECTION /PRICES</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL CATEGORY III</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal divided by 3:</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. M/Wbe Participation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- scored solely by M/Wbe coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Certified NCTRCA minority prime contractor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EEO 1 compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilization of certified minority subs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL CATEGORY IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 20, 2003

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Gloria Reyes, Buyer
SUBJECT: CONTRACT EXTENSION FOR ANNUAL MAINTENANCE FOR CENTIGRAM VOICE MAIL SYSTEM, BID #99-113

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

On May 18, 1999, the Dallas County Commissioners Court awarded the Annual Contract for Maintenance Services for Centigram Voice Mail System to Intermedia Technologies, Inc. (formerly Appiant Technologies) by Court Order #99-931 for the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2001. The contract has been extended twice by Court Order #2001-1067 and Court Order #2003-812, through May 31, 2003. The contract was for an initial two-year period with three one-year options to extend. This is the final option extension for this contract.

Intermedia Technologies has agreed to extend the contract for an additional year under the original contract terms and conditions. The Communications & Central Services Department currently manages the contract and recommends extending this contract.

INSURANCE AND M/WBE COMPLIANCE

Intermedia Technologies has provided the necessary and compliant insurance documents to conform to the bid specifications. In addition, they have provided Dallas County with an updated EEO1 form for your review.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The annual contract amount is $82,253.00 and is billed quarterly at $20,563.25. Funding is available in the FY03 budget of the General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION

Intermedia Technologies has provided excellent service the duration of this contract. The Purchasing Department, in conjunction with Communications & Central Services, recommends the Commissioners Court authorize the extension of Bid #99-113 with Intermedia Technologies for an additional year period beginning June 1, 2003 through May 31, 2004.

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

Recommended for Approval:

Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director

C: Chris Thompson, Communications & Central Services
    Virginia Porter, Auditor's Office
April 22, 2003

Ms. Gloria Reyes
Purchasing Department
The County of Dallas
509 Main Street, Records Bldg., Rm 623
Dallas, TX 75202

Dear Ms. Reyes,

Intermedia Technologies is pleased to extend the existing Comprehensive Annual Maintenance with Moves, Adds, and Changes Agreement to Dallas County. The service provided is based on the commitments of our original proposal for Bid No. 99-113, dated April 12, 1999.

The annual maintenance price will remain $82,253.00, to be billed quarterly at $20,563.25. The period of the Maintenance Agreement will be 06/01/03 through 05/31/04.

Gloria, Intermedia Technologies values Dallas County as a customer. Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at 916-787-5600 ext. 3313 or via email at sanderson@voiceplus.com. I look forward to speaking with you soon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Suzette Anderson
Account Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER.</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/General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators (Semi-Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 AMER.</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIFIC</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official/Managers</td>
<td>1</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>1</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>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators (Semi-Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Suzette Anderson, Account Manager

4/22/03
Date: May 14, 2003
To: Commissioners Court
From: John Hennessey
MIS Director
Subject: Oracle Software

Background

Dallas County currently licenses the Oracle Release 11 modules:
- General Ledger
- Accounts Receivable
- Grants
- Cash Management
- Accounts Payable
- Project Costing
- Fixed Assets
- Payroll
- Purchasing
- Project Billing
- Human Resources

Over the course of the past 2 years, the County has expanded its use of the Oracle database which leads to an increase in licensing costs. Oracle maintenance costs continue to increase each year. The Civil/JP Courts system will be Oracle based and require additional Oracle licenses under all options.

The new Oracle Release 11i contains many more functional modules which can provide the County with increased capabilities in Human Resources, Procurement, Finance, Service, Contract Management, Recruitment and Training. Specifically the County would receive the following modules:

- HR Intelligence
- Recruiting Administration
- Vendor Management
- Training Administration
- iSupport
- Mobile Field Service
- Call Center
- Internet Expenses
- Financial Analyzer
- Financials Intelligence
- Contracts
- Financials Intelligence
- Receivables
- Advanced Benefits

See the attached list of all e-Business Suite modules. Also attached is a brief description of each module. As is the case with all bundled and packaged software, purchasing the modules separately is much more expensive than purchasing the entire suite of products.
The goal of the County since the initial implementation of Oracle has been to move to a “self service” environment where employees and managers have direct access to information and can make appropriate updates themselves with the appropriate controls and security. The current release, Release 11, only provides a very limited amount of this “self service” functionality. The new Release 11i expands this capability significantly. Access is via a web browser and can be performed at any time of the day or night.

Negotiations with Oracle have produced a significant opportunity for the County. Oracle will provide its entire E-Business Suite, Collaboration Suite and Enterprise Database Edition at a significant reduction.

Financial Impact

Pricing Comparisons
List Price
- Oracle Software $4,586,200
- 1st Year Support $1,015,624
- 1st Year Total $5,601,824

Texas DIR Contract Rates
- Oracle Software $2,166,208
- 1st Year Support $ 769,204
- 1st Year Total $2,935,412

Dallas County Rate
- Oracle Software $ 689,876
- 1st Year Support $ 483,000
- 1st Year Total $ 1,172,876

Summary of Benefits
- $4.5 million of Oracle Software at a cost of $689,000
- 68% discount versus 40% for Texas DIR rates
- $1.5 million license savings over State DIR rates
- $1.6 million savings on 5 year support
- 5 year cost savings of $3.1 versus State DIR rates
- No Support fee increases for Years 2 through 4

Dallas County’s FY03 funding requirement would be
- $689,876 for License Fees (one time expense)
- $ 58,000 for FY03 prorated support fees
- $747,876 for 1st Year Prorated Total

Current FY03 Oracle Support fees are $765,000. With this agreement Oracle Support fees drop to $483,000 for years FY04 thru FY06 representing a savings of $282,000 each year. This one time payment from the Major Technology Fund results in a 3 year total savings of $846,000 in the General Fund, Fund 120.
The Oracle 11i Upgrade has been funded in the Major Technology Fund FY04 budget. See the attached Major Technology Fund 5 Year Summary dated 4/30/2003 for the current state of the fund and the Proposed Major Technology Fund Summary dated 5/13/2003 for funding details. Funding for this purchase can be accomplished in FY03 by using funds from the Civil Courts Project FY03 budget and repaying them in FY04. There is a total of $8.79 million available for Civil Courts between the FY03 and Prior Year balances. Most of the software license fees associated with the Civil/JP project will be shifted to FY04 under the current proposal from the vendor.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve the purchase of the full Oracle e-Business and Collaboration suite at a one time cost of $747,876 with fixed annual support fees of $482,306 for FY04 through FY06 with funding for the one time purchase from the Major Technology Fund. FY04 support fees will be funded through the Data Services Operating budget. (Fund 120, Dept 1090).
Oracle E-Business Suite - Applications Suite

Professional User

Marketing
  Marketing Online, Advanced Marketing Online, Trade Management, Marketing Intelligence

Sales
  TeleSales, Collections, Sales Online, Mobile Sales, Wireless Option for Sales, Quoting, Partners Online, Sales Intelligence, Incentive Compensation

Order Fulfillment
  Order Management (internal orders only), Advanced Pricing (internal orders only), Configurator, Mobile Supply Chain Applications, Warehouse Management

Procurement
  Purchasing, Purchasing Intelligence, iSupplier Portal

Maintenance Management
  Enterprise Asset Management

Service
  iSupport (support personnel and managers), TeleService, Service Online, Depot Repair, Spares Management, Wireless Option for Service, Advanced Service Online, Advanced Scheduler, Mobile Field Service, Quality Online, Service Intelligence, Customer Intelligence, CRM Data Model

Contracts
  Sales Contracts, Service Contracts, Rights Contracts, Project Contracts, Contracts Intelligence

Projects
  Project Costing, Project Billing, Project Resource Management, Product Development Exchange, CADView-3D

Financial
  Financials, Treasury, Financials & Sales Analyzers, Financials Intelligence

HR Applications
  Human Resources, Self-Service HR (HR personnel and managers), Advanced Benefits, HR Intelligence

Interaction Center
  Advanced Inbound, Advanced Outbound, Scripting, eMail Center, Interaction Center Intelligence

Other
  Data Librarian

Employee User

iProcurement, iSupport (non-support personnel), Internet Time, Internet Expenses, iReceivables, Self-Service HR (non-HR personnel), Training Administration, Customers Online

411 Elm Street  Dallas, Texas 75202  214-653-7327
Brief Module Description

Enterprise Asset Management – tracks costs of repairs, handles preventive maintenance schedules, maintains engineering data, work order history, bill of materials required, predefined maintenance activities, etc. for all categories of assets.

Field Service – Dispatch focused activities that allow management of service staff sent to fix problems called in by customers, skills management and certification tracking of dispatched staff, and management of service requests.

Mobile Field Service – allows service technicians to use laptops and handheld devices to receive, schedule and report on service and dispatched tasks.

Financial Analyzer – handles budget and forecast creation, review, modification, comprehensive “what-if” reporting, and spreadsheet links.

HR Intelligence – a performance management system that enables performance and process improvements in the workforce, detailed workforce analysis based on user-determined metrics, analyze trends in hiring and terminations, supports detailed ad-hoc query analysis.

Purchasing Intelligence – identify savings opportunities, view spending details, analyze procurement data, measure trends, analyze enterprise wide procurement data.

Internet Expenses- allows creation and submission of expense reports via the internet, enforces business rules and practices on expenses, routes expense reports to proper approving authority.

iProcurement – a self service requisition module that streamlines and enhances the requisition process, provides catalog management and enforces procurement rules, allows requisitioners to easily check order status, supports procurement cards for payment options, and enhances the standard requisition/purchase order process.

iReceivables – a web based self service module that allows billing and collections to be processed and managed at an enterprise level, supports internal and external users, accepts credit cards for payments.

iRecruitment – full cycle recruiting solution, fully automates the recruiting process, supports web based job application, matching and applicant tracking, allows hiring departments to be more involved in the hiring process, job notifications sent to registered users, review, rank and refer applicants.

iSupplier – web based, secure site that allows suppliers to view purchase orders, handle routine supplier inquiries, send electronic purchase orders, register suppliers, access bids, RFPs, RFQs, RFOs, supports buyer-supplier

411 Elm Street  Dallas, Texas 75202  214-653-7327
Email:  website:  214-653-7327

communications

iSupport – allows users to submit service requests, make name change requests, track requests, administer customer surveys, interact with various departments electronically

SelfService HR – employees have direct access to and can update their own information, managers have access to and can update their employees information, compensation management, absence management, manage transfers, promotions, re-grading, terminations.

Training Administration – provides online access to training materials, record keeping, manage class scheduling and training resources, allow employees to sign up and be notified of class availability
## Major Technology Fund 5-Year Plan Summary

**04/30/2003**

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>110,409</td>
<td>492,409</td>
<td>1,961,981</td>
<td>1,113,346</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings / Interfund Trans.</td>
<td>570,300</td>
<td>110,702</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>188,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6,845,372</td>
<td>6,907,489</td>
<td>8,600,490</td>
<td>7,990,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prior Years Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Upgrade</td>
<td>288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Courts System Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Urban Counties</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal / Warrants / Bonds</td>
<td>138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Touch Screen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCD Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Services Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works 911/ GIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Tracking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Case Billing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Upgrade 11i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIR Computer Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile-Probation Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Crime Lab Evidence Track</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>5,927,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ending Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Target (10% of Expenditures)</td>
<td>1,194,909</td>
<td>1,961,981</td>
<td>1,113,346</td>
<td>6,890,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Projects

- Sheriff's Intake: 350,000
- Wireless Connectivity: 125,000
- Build vs Buy Consulting Engagement: 0
- Oracle 11i Assessment: 227,500

**Total Additional Projects**: 702,500

### Revised Ending Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>492,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Major Technology Fund 5-Year Plan Summary**

**PROPOSED**

05/13/2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>110,409</td>
<td>492,409</td>
<td>1,961,981</td>
<td>1,113,346</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings / Interfund Trans.</td>
<td>570,300</td>
<td>110,702</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>188,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6,845,372</td>
<td>6,907,489</td>
<td>8,600,490</td>
<td>7,990,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Upgrade</td>
<td>288,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Courts System Replacement</td>
<td>4,500,000 3,547,107 2,143,309 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Urban Counties</td>
<td>92,733 61,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal / Warrants / Bonds</td>
<td>7,287,144 900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Touch Screen</td>
<td>350,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI Upgrade</td>
<td>138,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Services Upgrade</td>
<td>57,000 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works 911/GIS</td>
<td>115,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Tracking</td>
<td>173,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Records</td>
<td>230,000 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Case Billing</td>
<td>747,623 2,252,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Upgrade 11i</td>
<td>103,319 200,000 200,000 200,000 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIR Computer Equipment</td>
<td>220,031 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce Expansion</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 34</td>
<td>149,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile-Probation Services</td>
<td>220,000 109,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>619,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Imaging</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>5,927,019 5,650,463 4,945,508 7,487,144 1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENDING BALANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Target (10% of Expenditures)</td>
<td>1,194,909 1,961,981 1,113,346 6,890,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL PROJECTS**

|                       |        |
| Sheriff's intake      | 350,000 |
| Wireless Connectivity | 125,000 |
| Build vs Buy Consulting Engagement | 0 |
| Oracle 11i Assessment | 227,500 |
| **Total Additional Projects** | 702,500 |

**REVISED ENDING BALANCE**

|                       |        |
|                       | 492,409 |
Date: May 14, 2003
To: Commissioners Court
From: John Hennessey, MIS Director
Subject: Network Infrastructure Upgrade

**Background**

The County's current network infrastructure has been in place for more than 3 years without any significant changes or upgrades. As the county shifts from a mainframe environment to a more distributed network based environment for its courts and financial applications a significantly higher demand is placed on the infrastructure. The infrastructure of network devices, switches, routers, hubs, data circuits, and servers requires major improvements to support the County's direction of a county-wide imaging system as well as the new Civil and JP Courts system. The same network improvements will support both imaging and civil courts. A smaller scale upgrade has been previously approved by the Court to upgrade the data circuits to the JP facilities and locations along Langdon Road.

Schlumberger has developed a long range plan for the County's network as part of the analysis for upgrading the infrastructure. Part of that long range plan would be implemented with these upgrades. The current network configuration dated 3/2/2003 and the long term plan diagrams are attached.

**Financial Impact**

The Civil/JP Courts Management project budget has been developed to include $4,467,600 one time expense for network infrastructure upgrades, servers and desktop computers and $277,000 in reoccurring maintenance costs. Detailed cost information is provided in the following table:
### JP/CIVIL Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Reoccurring</th>
<th>5 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$483,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customization</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaces</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Total</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$4,805,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$6,195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$4,467,600</td>
<td>$277,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,300,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,107,600</td>
<td>$4,805,000</td>
<td>$607,500</td>
<td>$11,735,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Available in the Major Technology Fund for the Civil/JP Courts project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2003</th>
<th>FY2004</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Years Available Balance</td>
<td>$ 4,500,000</td>
<td>$ 4,294,730</td>
<td>$10,190,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The equipment line item above consists of desktop computers, servers, scanners, printers, network infrastructure equipment, diagnostic tools and data circuits. This briefing addresses desktop computers, printers, network infrastructure equipment, diagnostic tools and data circuits. It does not address servers, scanners or any Schlumberger installation services at this time. Schlumberger is developing an implementation plan and any costs associated with Schlumberger implementation will be briefed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY2001 Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Projected FY2003 Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computers - 600</td>
<td>$1,625,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Printers - 34</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,635,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$599,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabling</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Software</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Circuits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Network Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>$864,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,328,000</td>
<td>$1,932,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated that approximately 600 desktop computers will be purchased for the courts project. Because of this large volume of computers, the MIS Director and the Purchasing Director have determined that the County would best be served by bidding the procurement of these computers. The bid will be based...
on the County standard desktop computer and a value computer that would be sufficient to run the new courts management and imaging systems. The bid will also include any services necessary for the de-installation of existing computers, transfer of data and installation of new computers. The lower cost value computer has the potential to significantly reduce the overall desktop computer budget by as much as 25% based on the FY2003 projection.

The 34 network printers will be installed as follows:
- George Allen
  - 1st floor: 2 printers
  - floors 2-6: 20 printers with 4 per floor
- Records Bldg
  - floors 2,3,4,6: 4 printers with 1 per floor
- JP locations: 8 printers

**Operational Impact**

The network upgrade will position the County to maximize its investment in both a Courts system and an Imaging system. It will provide for increased network performance and response as well as eliminating single points of failure. The network is designed such that, short of a major catastrophe, a data circuit outage will not prevent the Courts from continuing to operate or the Imaging system from continuing to function. Connectivity will be maintained although the network performance may be slowed by the outage as information would be re-routed over the remaining circuits.

**Schedule**

The network improvements will be installed first to insure that all equipment has been properly configured, data circuit improvements made and the equipment is functioning normally. It is anticipated that the network improvements will be completed before the implementation begins for the courts and imaging system.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Commissioners Court approve the network infrastructure upgrade at a cost of $1,932,462 with funding from the Major Technology Fund, Civil/JP Courts project. It is further recommended that the Commissioners Court authorize the Purchasing Director to issue a bid/RFP for the purchase of the desktop computers with specifications to be developed by County MIS staff using the County standard computer configuration and a value computer configuration and to include necessary services to de-install, transfer data and install new computers.
## Equipment Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computers</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges/Coordinators</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges/Coordinators</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Services</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Services</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Jury</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP and Staff</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constables</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (MIS, Auditor)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Records Building</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Cisco 6509 Switches</td>
<td>$144,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Private Network Connection</td>
<td>20,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco PIX Firewall</td>
<td>16,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cisco 3550 Switches</td>
<td>58,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Records Building</strong></td>
<td><strong>$239,377</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### George Allen

| 2 Cisco 6509 Switches                     | $148,037  |
| 18 Cisco 3550 Switches                   | 57,140    |
| **Total GACB**                            | **$205,177** |

#### Henry Wade JJC

| 1 Cisco 6509 Switch                       | $76,189   |
| 1 Cisco 4006 Switch                       | 2,787     |
| 1 Cisco 3550 Switch                       | 31,744    |
| **Total Henry Wade**                      | **$110,719** |

| Maintenance                                | $44,188   |
| **TOTAL Network Equipment**                | **$599,462** |
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Dallas County Network Connectivity
w/ Gigaman
High-Level Overview
5/14/2003

20-meg connection to Internet via Gigaman circuit

Gigaman over Fiber 1000 Mb/s
T-1 over Copper 1544 Mb/s
County Fiber 1000 Gb/s

JD  Juvenile Detention
JP  Justice of the Peace
RB  Road & Bridge
FCCB  Frank Crowley Courts Bldg
GACB  George Allen Courts Bldg
HHS  Health & Human Services
JJC  Henry Wade Juvenile Justice Center

Frank Crowley Courts Bldg
GACB
ADMIN Ethernet
10/100/1000

Gigaman over Fiber

N/S/E Govt Ctrs
Truancy Cts.
Central Collections

FCCB
Ethemet
10/100/1000

RECORDS
Ethemet
10/100/1000

JJC
Ethemet
10/100/1000

HHS
Ethemet
10/100/1000

R&B's
Mic. Sites
JD's
JP's

Juvenile Detention
Justice of the Peace
Road & Bridge
Frank Crowley Courts Bldg
George Allen Courts Bldg
Health & Human Services
Henry Wade Juvenile Justice Center

20-meg connection to Internet via Gigaman circuit
May 20, 2003

To: Commissioners Court
From: Dan Savage
Subject: Rationale Same day Briefing and Court Order

This will speed up the process for receiving the new bids for the George Allen Civil Courts project.
May 20, 2003

To: Commissioners Court
From: Dan Savage
Subject: George Allen Civil Courts Project Re-bid

Background
On January 30, 2003 eight bids were received for the George Allen Civil Courts project. The contractor selection criteria were very specific about the qualifications and experience required of the general contractors and the three key project personnel. None of the five lowest bidders met all of the qualification and experience requirements. The three highest bidders submitted bids in excess of the project cost estimate and the project budget. On May 13, 2003, the Commissioners Court rejected all bids and instructed staff to begin the process of re-advertising for bids.

To move forward through the re-bid process as quickly as possible, staff suggests that the project be re-bid using the same construction plans and specifications as were used on the original bid. Because of the difficulties encountered in meeting the previous evaluation criteria, staff suggests using Section 262 of the Local Government Code which involves awarding the bid to the responsible bidder who submits the lowest and best bid. This will simplify the evaluation process and focus the award on price.

If this approach is followed, then the following is a suggested schedule of events:

1. Advertise for bids on May 26th, June 2nd, June 9th and June 16th.
2. Hold pre-bid conference on Wednesday, June 4th at 2:00 p.m. in the Central Jury Room at George Allen Civil Courts Building.
3. Receive bids at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2003.

4. Brief Commissioners Court on June 24th or July 1st.

5. Award contract on July 1st or July 8th.

Impact On Operations
This approach will simplify the re-bid process and make the evaluation process more straightforward. It will not address the four options suggested by Judge Keliher. Staff is prepared to bring forward a fee proposal from HLM Design which sets forth a schedule and cost for this design work as a separate briefing item. It will take between three and four months for these construction plans to be prepared. This would delay the re-bidding of the George Allen project.

Financial Impact
Funding for the George Allen project is included in the FY 2003 Major Capital Improvement Program.

Legal
This approach changes the bidding process from the alternative project delivery methods authorized by Chapter 271 of the Local Government Code to the traditional competitive bidding requirements set forth in Chapter 262 of the Local Government Code.

MWBE
The Dallas County MWBE policies will be followed with this bid.

Recommendation
Staff recommends authorizing the re-advertising for bids for the George Allen Civil Courts project using the same construction plans and specifications as used on the original bid and changing the bid award process to follow the requirements set forth under Chapter 262 of the Local Government Code. A Court Order has been submitted for consideration at today’s meeting.

Recommended by

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
May 20, 2003

To: Commissioners Court
From: Dan Savage
Subject: Parking Garage Feasibility Study Update

BACKGROUND
In March of 2002, the firm of DeShazo, Tang and Associates, working as a sub-consultant to Vidaud and Associates, prepared a feasibility study for the proposed underground parking garage located at Founders Plaza. This study showed that it was financially feasible to construct this proposed garage. Since then, the firm of Jacob’s Facilities, Inc. has been selected to undertake the detail design work on both the plaza redevelopment and the underground parking garage. As part of the initial work on this project, DeShazo, Tang and Associates has been asked to update its feasibility report using the following assumptions: (1) Option I is a three-level garage with 460 spaces costing $11,000,000; (2) Option II is a four-level garage with 630 spaces costing $13,500,000; (3) the project would be financed with 20-year bonds at an interest rate of 4.3% (4) the bonds would be repaid with parking revenues, but would be backed by a general obligation tax pledge just like the George Allen underground parking garage; (5) and that the monthly contract parking rate would be raised to a minimum of $90. A copy of this report is being provided to the Court separate from this briefing.

The DeShazo report looks at two development scenarios. Scenario A is the nominal growth scenario which takes into consideration only current development or definitely planned development. This is a very conservative scenario. Scenario B is the aggressive growth scenario, which assumes all potential development occurs in the surrounding area, based on current development standards. This is a very optimistic picture of future demand. In all probability actual development will occur somewhere between these two extreme pictures of future development.

The update of the surrounding property presented in Appendix B identified little change in development plans in the surrounding area over the past year. The one exception is private landscaping projects that will reduce the total number of surface parking spaces on blocks 16, 20, and 21B by 369 spaces.
**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The parking garage will be financed with “double barrel” bonds. Parking revenues will be used to pay for the operation and maintenance expenses as well as the debt service. Property tax revenues will be pledged to backup the parking revenues. This will enable the County to get a AAA bond rating. If the project were financed with parking revenue bonds, the County would have to maintain a debt coverage ratio of 1.5 to 1. This reserve will not be required for “double barrel” bonds. For study purposes a conservative coverage ratio of 1.25 to 1 was used. In reality a 1 to 1 coverage will be needed. Table 12 on page 18 of the study summarizes the results of the various options. The three-level garage (460 spaces) is financially feasible under all scenarios while the four-level garage is marginally feasible under the nominal growth, but is feasible under the aggressive growth scenario. If some portion of the development potential of the aggressive scenario occurs, then the likelihood is that the four-level garage (630 spaces) will work. This can be accomplished in part by partnering with surrounding property owners, both public and private, to acquire an ownership interest in a certain number of spaces within the garage.

To make sure the project works financially several options have been presented that involve raising the current rates which are substantially below the market rates for comparable parking. The consultant has also developed options which involve using funds now committed to debt service in the existing garage (roughly $200,000 per year) and additional revenue from the existing garage after the proposed rates are adapted (approximately $150,000 per year). While the DeShazo study does not present this option, another way to improve the cash flow on the project would be to finance it over at 30-year period at 4.62%. This would reduce the debt service on the three-level garage by $150,000 per year, and on the four-level garage by $186,000. These figures were supplied by Matt Boles with RBC Dain Rauscher, the County’s Financial Advisor.

**IMPACT ON OPERATIONS**

The financial feasibility study shows that the three-level garage is feasible under even the most conservative scenario. This garage will meet the parking needs for Dallas County for the foreseeable future. The four-level garage is less feasible under the nominal growth scenario, but is clearly feasible under the aggressive growth scenario. One way to ensure that the four-level garage option will work is to partner with surrounding property owners and have them acquire an ownership interest in some or all of the spaces that would be available if the fourth level were built.

**LEGAL**

If the Commissioners Court is interested in partnering with surrounding property owners the development of partnering agreements will have to be done in accordance with state and federal legal requirements. Private property investment will have to be tailored to avoid jeopardizing the tax exempt status of the bonds.

**M/WBE**

Not applicable.
RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Commissioners Court accepts the findings presented in the DeShazo report, and that the Jacobs Facilities, Inc., design team be authorized to proceed with the detailed design work on the parking garage. Staff further recommends that the four-level design option be adopted and that efforts begin to obtain partnering agreements with surrounding public and private property owners.

Recommended by

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
Date: May 14, 2003

To: Members of the Commissioners Court

From: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D., Director

Subject: Policy – Leave of Absence – Juvenile Department

Background
Pursuant to County policy 82-473, the Juvenile Department is requesting an additional leave of absence for a 20-year Dallas County employee who began leave on January 13, 2003 and exhausted her leave eligibility under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) on April 4. At that time, the Department granted a six-week leave of absence that is due to expire on May 16, a total of 18 weeks. The employee now seeks additional time to recover from her illness and return to work.

According to her providers, the employee will be in a position to return to full duty with limited future absences, at the end of September 2003. The Department seeks to retain her, as she has been a long-term, valued employee.

Impact on Operations
The Department has indicated that they have temporarily realigned her responsibilities without the need for temporary help. However, the approval of an additional 19.5 weeks of leave may lead other employees to believe that all requests for extended leaves of absence will be granted.

Financial Impact
The Juvenile Department expects to save the $5000 in unexpended salary associated with this position.

Recommendation
The request for Commissioners Court approval for the additional leave of absence complies with Section 82-473 of the Dallas County Code. Therefore, the Human Resources/Civil Service Department respectfully submits this request for the additional leave of absence for a time period through September 30, 2003.

Recommended by: Mattye Mauldin-Taylor, Ph.D.

Attachment
Dallas County

TO: Mattye Mauldin-Taylor, Director of Human Resources/Civil Service
FROM: Mike Griffiths, Director, Juvenile Services
SUBJECT: Request for Leave of Absence
DATE: May 8, 2003

Background
Pursuant to County policy 82-473, the Juvenile Department requests approval of a leave of absence for a 20 year Dallas County employee who has exhausted leave eligibility under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and was previously granted a six-week leave of absence by the Department which expires on May 18th. Now seeks an additional period of absence to recover from illness and return to work.

According to the physician, and the treating Program Coordinator, will be in a position to return to work no later than the end of September 2003. It is expected that will be able to fully return to work with limited future absences. The Juvenile Department desires to retain as has been a long-term and valued employee.

Impact on Operations
The Unit where performs duties has temporarily realigned responsibilities so as to cover duties without the need for temporary help.

Financial Impact
The Department will not utilize the unexpended salary associated with this position (approximately $5,000).

Recommendation
It is recommend that Human Resources requests that the Commissioners Court authorize a leave of absence for to allow for the completion of medical treatments and return to work no later than September 30, 2003.
Date: May 14, 2003
To: Members of the Commissioners Court
From: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D., Director
Subject: Courtesy Patrol Salary Consideration

Background
On June 4, 2002, Commissioners Court authorized the transfer to Dallas County of the Courtesy Patrol Program from the Dallas District of the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) (Court Order 2002-1032). The Human Resources/Civil Services Department classified the transferring positions and identified salaries for those transferring. The recommendations were consistent with the program and resulted in no net decrease in salary with two exceptions requiring approval from Commissioners Court.

When the positions were classified, five levels were created for the Courtesy Patrol Program: Recruit, grade 06, Technician I, grade 07, Technician II (Shift Supervisor), grade 08, Program Supervisor, grade A, and Program Manager, grade D. Currently, TxDot has assistant shift leader positions that will also transfer and were not included in the original five levels. In lieu of shifting the position grades, the Sheriff’s Department is requesting that the technicians acting in these roles be placed in a grade 07, Technician slot and receive special pay of $75 per month, similar to training officers currently employed.

The department also requests an adjustment from $12.69 per hour (his current salary) to $13.11 per hour of one senior TxDOT employee willing to transfer to Dallas County. This will allow the employee to maintain his current net level of pay.

Impact on Operations
The creation of a stipend will compensate employees assuming the additional responsibility of shift leader. The transfer of all other TxDOT employees to Dallas County resulted in no net loss of pay. How, due to the tenure of the senior employee involved in the requested adjustment, a net loss in pay will occur if the employee transfers.

Financial Impact
The annual cost associated with this request is approximately $5,200, including benefits and is reimbursable to Dallas County.

Recommendation
The Human Resources/Civil Services Department recommends Commissioners Court approve $75 per month in special duty pay for the Courtesy Patrol Technicians. HR does not recommend the salary increase for the senior employee recommended for transfer because it does not comply with provisions outlined in the Dallas County Code. However, the department’s request is respectfully submitted for Commissioners Court consideration.

Recommended by: Mattye Mauldin Taylor, Ph.D., Director
May 14, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

From: Ryan Brown
Budget Officer

Subject: Requests for Exception to Hiring Freeze

Background
Commissioners Court instituted a hiring freeze effective March 11, 2003, to address the County’s current year budget shortfall. This hiring freeze applies to all positions except those related to life-safety issues or mandated staffing ratios. Departments are allowed to request exceptions for specific situations.

The Office of Budget and Evaluation has received exception requests from the following departments: Data Services, Public Works, Public Defender and Justice of the Peace Precinct 2-1. The purpose of this briefing is to make recommendations on these requests.

Operational Impact
The specifics of each request are discussed in the paragraphs below and copies of the formal requests are attached to this briefing. As previously discussed, departments are being allowed to hold a similar position or positions vacant for a period longer than the 15-week requirement to meet the hiring freeze obligation. This alternative method meets the objective of the hiring freeze to generate salary lag and allows the departments some discretion in managing their staffing levels and workload.

Data Services
The Management Information Systems Director requests exception to the 15 week hiring freeze for a new and vacant Information Systems Coordinator (IM) position that was authorized in the FY2003 budget but has not been filled this fiscal year. Data Services has no similar vacant position to be held for a period longer than the 15-weeks in exchange for the requested hiring exception to meet the hiring freeze obligation.
This new position, was originally requested by the District Clerk’s office in the FY2003 budget, and was subsequently placed under the supervision of the MIS Director to manage County-wide imaging needs such as the JP/Civil Courts imaging project and all other imaging projects that are ongoing at the Sheriff's Office, District Clerk, and Human Resource. Having someone on board is critical in moving these projects forward and avoiding costly delays. The MIS Director received applications for the position before the freeze and identified a finalist around the time the freeze took effect. Also, the finalist that was identified may find another opportunity and the hiring process will have to be restarted, thus adding more time to the already long delay.

To date, the vacant position has created about $38,948 or 9% salary lag in the Data Services Department. Approval of the MIS Director's hiring freeze exception request will mean foregoing another six weeks (weeks left in the hiring freeze) of savings totaling $7,875 including benefits. The Office of Budget and Evaluation does not recommend an exception to hiring freeze for the vacant Information Systems Coordinator.

Public Works
The Public Works Department is authorized four full-time Civil Engineering Designers (FM) and two full-time Senior Civil Designers (IM). The department has had a vacant grade FM position since July 2001 and another one became vacant on May 16, 2003. In addition, one of the two grade IM position became vacant on March 31, 2003. For this, the Public Works Department currently has three of the six Civil Designer positions vacant. The department is requesting an exception to fill two of the three vacant positions.

The department has indicated that without the positions, key projects will be delayed and the County will lose revenue from partnering cities. They have also indicated that their department is entirely funded from Capital and Bond funds and have no impact to the general fund. Although the department is correct on their funding structure, the 15-week vacancy savings for the two positions would result in a savings of $32,881. The savings could be utilized for future projects.

The department has advised the Office of Budget and Evaluation that qualified candidates for Civil Design positions have been historically difficult to fill and two qualified candidates have currently been located. The Office of Budget and Evaluation does not recommend an exception to the hiring freeze.

Public Defender
Chief Public Defender, Jeanette Green, is requesting exceptions to the hiring freeze for two attorney positions and related promotions. Due to the recent creation of a Public Defender in County Criminal Court #2, and the death of a felony attorney, several vacancies have become available, and filling these positions with internal candidates, as preferred by the Chief Public Defender, will create several promotions.

The cost-effectiveness of Public Defenders is monitored quarterly by the Office of Budget and Evaluation with the results published in the Volume 2: Judicial Management Report (see Dallas County Management Report attachments). At this time, the use of Public Defenders in the County Criminal and Criminal District Courts is cost-effective in every court. Currently, the misdemeanor courts average $150 per case for court appointed attorneys and $62 per case for the Public Defender. In the felony courts, the average cost per case for appointed attorneys is $373 and $175 per case for Public Defenders. Both of the requested exceptions are for positions that handle cases in either the felony or misdemeanor courts. In all cases, any
prolonged vacancy of a position will result in increased costs associated with judges hiring more court appointed attorneys than would be needed had the vacant position been filled. The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends the requested Attorney exceptions to the hiring freeze and related promotions.

Justice of the Peace Precinct 2-1 (Judge Cooper) – Temporary Clerks
Judge Cooper is requesting an exception be granted for Precinct 2-1 utilizing two temporary clerks for the AutoCite cases. Currently, the Collections Center has temporarily relocated one of their approved temporary clerks to Precinct 2-1 to assist with the unexpected increase in the volume of front desk activity, telephone calls and incoming mail received by the court due to AutoCite.

If the exception is granted the two clerks will assist with filings, answering phones, processing warrants, recalling warrants, and appeals. Also, the clerks will be utilized as relief during lunchtime at the counter. During the transition of filing AutoCite cases from five precincts to Precinct 2-1, there was no increase in staffing for Justice of the Peace Cooper to handle walk up customers related AutoCite cases. It was anticipated that direct services provided by the Precinct would be minimally impacted by the AutoCite cases. However, after the first full month of AutoCite cases filings in Precinct 2-1, there has been an immediate increase in volume of front desk, telephone and mail activities. Judge Cooper indicates that it has been very difficult for one clerk and a temporary clerk to manage the daily activities required in processing the AutoCite cases.

The latter part of March was when the transition of the AutoCite Program from five Precincts to Precinct 2-1 went into effect. There was a period of decreased activity with 5,514 cases filed in March 2003. During April 2003 there were 7,314 AutoCite cases filed in Precinct 2-1. The FY2004 Justice of the Peace staffing will be appropriately adjusted to take into account any activity change in the Justice of the Peace Offices as a result of all AutoCite cases being filed in one Office. The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends an exception to the use of temporary employees for Justice of the Peace 2-1.

Justice of the Peace Precinct 2-1 (Judge Cooper)
Judge Cooper is authorized ten full-time positions (1 grade C chief clerk, 1 grade 7 bookkeeper, and 8 grade 5 clerks). Effective May 23, 2003, one grade 5 clerk position will become vacant. Under the hiring freeze requirements, this results in 15 weeks of vacancy obligation. Judge Cooper is requesting an exception to the hiring freeze to replace the clerk.

The clerk position that will become vacant is one of two clerks processing truancy cases and is their bilingual clerk. The court dockets are set through September 10, 2003 and has an additional 600 truancy cases needing to be set. It is anticipated that GISD will stop filing cases the last week in May 2003. It is expected that by the time the position is posted and filled the current vacancy would have full-filled 2-3 weeks of the obligation for Precinct 2-1. Due to the increased workload resulting from the AutoCite program (see temporary clerks exception above) the Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends an exception to the hiring freeze.
Financial Impact
The savings realized from holding each of the positions discussed above vacant for 15 weeks is shown in the table below. If these positions are filled, the savings will not be realized unless the departments identify additional positions to be held vacant for longer periods of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>15-week savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Attorney 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$33,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Attorney 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$65,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Services</td>
<td>Information Systems IM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P. Precinct 2-1</td>
<td>Clerk 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$8,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Civil Designer FM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Senior Civil Designer IM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
The Office of Budget and Evaluation makes the following recommendations.

Data Services Recommends no exception be granted.
Public Works Recommends no exception be granted.
J.P. Precinct 2-1 (Cooper) Recommends exception be granted.
J.P. Precinct 2-1 (Cooper) Temps Recommends exception be granted.
Public Defender – Attorneys 1 and 5 Recommends exception be granted.
Date: April 30, 2003

To: Carlo Pacot, Budget Analyst
Office of Budget and Evaluation

From: John Hennessey
MIS Director

Subject: Exception to Hiring Freeze – Imaging Systems Administrator

During the FY03 budget process the District Clerk’s office submitted a PIR for an Imaging Systems Administrator. The Commissioners Court approved the position but placed it reporting to the MIS Director so that imaging can be approached from a County-wide perspective. The job description was created and sent to Human Resources for scoring and grading. Human Resources submitted the job to the Civil Service Commission December 17, 2002 for the January monthly meeting. Civil Service Commission approved the position on January 27, 2003. The job requisition was created on January 31, 2003 and applications received over the next several weeks. Interviews have been conducted, a finalist has been identified and a salary analysis has been completed. The position has been vacant since it was created on October 1, 2003.

Imaging projects currently in progress:
- Sheriff’s Imaging expansion project for Intake
- District Clerk’s imaging pilot for minute books
- Human Resources benefit forms scanning

The JP/Civil Courts project will require significant imaging components. Additional imaging needs have been identified in the County Auditor’s office, the County Clerk’s office (Property Records), and the Sheriff’s department (fingerprints and inmate housing records).

The position has been open for approximately 7 weeks since the hiring freeze. If the position is not filled before the 15 weeks have been completed, the Civil Courts imaging project may be delayed and the finalist identified for the position may find another opportunity. If the finalist does find another job, the entire hiring process must be restarted which will add to the delays.

The MIS Director requests an exception to the hiring freeze instituted on March 11, 2003.
12 May 2003

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Ryan Brown, Director, Office of Budget and Evaluation

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

SUBJECT: Proposed Exception to Hiring Freeze

BACKGROUND

Due to the recent, unexpected resignation of two of our six civil engineering designers, Public works currently has only 3 of 6 line designers. This has been further exacerbated by the vacancy in the Bridge Specialist position that the Court transferred to Public Works, since this bridge coordination and design work must be made up by the design section. Having 50% fill of our important in-house engineer design staff impacts our project delivery capability and affects our total project and program costs. These designers are typically assigned the primary technical responsibility to move projects forward on a daily basis while coordinating with the other employees and a Project Manager who leads the entire effort for project delivery. Our entire MCIP 5-Phase Project Delivery system is built on the assumption of keeping a small, but capable and well-equipped in-house design staff. Without this staff, we are less able to negotiate effectively with design consultants, nor are we able to accomplish designs economically, since we know if we effectively manage our design business unit and Department, we can produce selected project designs with a ~40% savings compared to a consultant. In addition, with the ground-breaking MCIP Master Agreement that has been signed by all of our cities, we are able to recoup 50% of our in-house design and project delivery efforts (based on actual charges documented in our own labor reporting system). In our PW Business Plan, these in-house efforts therefore are viewed as “income earnings” and are critical to living within our projected In-House Project Delivery budgets (IHPD). For example, assuming we can fill these design positions, we are projecting billing our partners a total of $231,000 during FY 2003.

There is a continuing shortage of experienced civil engineers at the production level, and we have only seen a small trickle of qualified applicants, even during this lull in the economy. We currently have applications from two experienced engineers (with E.I.T. licenses) for designer positions for which we are requesting an exception from the present hiring freeze. Whenever we come across highly qualified applicants, which is the case with applicants Gail Rodriguez and Tewodros Tegene, we need to take advantage of it.

Our rationale is that failure to fill these positions will delay key projects and cost the County both time and money. There are no savings at all in keeping them vacant. In fact we waste valuable license fees for Microstation and GEOPACK design software that goes unused. We would be negligent if we did not request an exception, since our Public Works Business Plan is built on the economies of having a capable in-house design staff, as part of our total optimal
project delivery capability. We further propose that an engineering intern (if one can be found) be hired for this summer as a low-cost way to assist in the production effort (in lieu of filling the 3rd vacant designer this summer).

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Public Works is funded entirely from Capital or other program funds; not directly from the General Fund. Any hire lag 'savings' will not help the General Fund but will increase the cost of the projects during design, ROW acquisition, and construction phases in the Capital programs. Since the total project cost was programmed for a specific fiscal year for construction, delays mean project budgets will be inadequate. Our PW Business Plan imperatives dictate that we inform the Court of the impacts of continued vacancies in these positions which have a direct relationship to project delivery. Under our Business Plan, these people are basically ‘fully chargeable’ meaning they are essential for us meeting our chargeability performance measures. Combined, two of these designers were assigned to and scheduled to produce Plans, Specs and Estimates (PS&E) for MCIP projects with associated construction costs of approximately $41M in estimated local project construction costs on MCIP projects. If we are required to employ consultants instead these design costs will increase by an estimated 40%. We will also lose the opportunity of billing our city partners for 50% of their chargeable work.

If we are allowed to proceed as recommended (to fill the vacancies), our annual budget for FY 2003 will still be approximately 8% below our previously approved budget for FY03, due primarily to hire lag and budget savings efforts.

M/WBE INFORMATION

The two candidates are the best qualified of those who have applied and both happen to be minorities. Minorities in the civil engineering field are significantly under-represented, and we now have a significant opportunity to achieve progress in this area, even while doing what is best from a PW Business Plan perspective.

SCHEDULE

Continued vacancies of 50% in the Design Section combined with a vacancy in the Bridge Specialist position have combined to impact our project delivery schedules. The MCIP Project Delivery System is built on the concept of keeping projects on schedule to move them into construction phase during the assigned Program Year. DELAYS EQUAL COST INCREASES, SCHEDULE DELAYS AND POSSIBLE SCOPE DECREASES. This has been the primary lesson learned from the 1991 Bond Program, and we have designed the new MCIP Project Delivery System to be different.

It will take four months to get consultants on board and started. Delays from the present schedule will cause construction cost increases of 3% per year due to inflation alone. Following is a list of actual projects impacted:
RBD#1 – Preston Rd: Mimosa to Royal, PY07
RBD#2 – Mockingbird Lane: W. Lawther to E. Lawther, PY04
RBD#3 – MLK Blvd.: Trinity to Gould, PY05
RBD#3 – Cockrell Hill Rd: Wintergreen to FM 1382, PY06
RBD#3 – Wintergreen Rd: IH35E to Houston Sch Rd, PY07
RBD#4 – Wintergreen Rd: Cockrell Hill Rd to City Limit, PY 06
RBD#1, #3, & #4 – Intersections in CO Dallas, PY05

RECOMMENDATION

The Director of Public Works recommends that this Department be allowed to proceed with the hiring process for two civil engineering designers and one engineering intern on the basis of cost and time savings and no increased cost to the General Fund.

RECOMMENDED BY:

Donald R. Holzwarth, P.E.
Director of Public Works
May 12, 2003

Commissioners Court
Administration Building
411 Elm St.
Dallas, Texas, 75202

Re: Public Defender’s Request for Exemptions to the Hiring Freeze

Dear Commissioners,

On May 6, 2003, you ordered the creation of a new Public Defender position and an exemption to the hiring freeze for an Attorney 2 position in Judge Pask’s Court (CCC # 2). I would prefer to internally post the Attorney 2 position and promote from within my office. This would create a vacancy in another misdemeanor court and require me to post an Attorney 1 position. I need an exemption to the hiring freeze for an Attorney 1 position in conjunction with the existing exemption for the Attorney 2 position to accomplish this without causing harm to another court or added cost to the County.

I am also requesting multiple exemptions to fill the Attorney 5 position that was recently left vacant by the death of King Solomon, who had worked for the P.D.’s office for almost 15 years. He supervised four felony attorneys and was one of two attorneys assigned to Judge Alvarez’s Court. He handled a high volume of cases. I need to put someone in that Court as soon as possible to keep our assignment of cases at the same level. To do so, I need to internally post an Attorney 5, 4, 3, and 2. I would also need to post an Attorney 1 to the public, preferable at the same time.

These requests are made since vacancies in any area of my office will result in additional court-appointed attorney’s fees being paid out of County funds. As all attorney positions in my office are cost effective and save the County money, I would respectfully request the exemptions listed above.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Drescher Green
Chief Public Defender
DALLAS COUNTY MANAGEMENT REPORT
For the three months ending December 31, 2002
District Criminal Courts

INDICATOR: Court by court comparison of legal costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POs Assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Avg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Appeal assignments and attorney payments

Indigent Defense Cost per Case (excludes Death Penalty costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Cost Per Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>$527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netts</td>
<td>$397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancarrow</td>
<td>$362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>$361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>$324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniels</td>
<td>$294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Francis</td>
<td>$274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Creuzot</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netts</td>
<td>$221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY2003 Average
### Public Defender Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>PD's Assigned</th>
<th>Cases Assigned</th>
<th>Cost of PD's</th>
<th>Cost per Case Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pruitt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wyde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>17,174</td>
<td>$83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Taite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>$56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>31,852</td>
<td>$64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crowder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>31,852</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>30,689</td>
<td>$118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appis 2</td>
<td>Burson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>17,174</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>$240,471</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cases per Public Defender

- **Number of Cases:**
  - Pruitt: 130
  - Fox: 208
  - Wyde: 221
  - Clancy: 226
  - Burson: 247
  - Fuller: 268
  - Crowder: 291
  - Barker: 293
  - Taite: 319
  - Anderson: 345
  - Roden: 319
  - Jones: 373

### Public Defender Cost per Assignment

- **Cost per Assignment:**
  - Fox: $118
  - Wyde: $83
  - Burson: $76
  - Clancy: $72
  - Fuller: $64
  - Crowder: $60
  - Taite: $56
  - Barker: $54
  - Anderson: $60
  - Roden: $48
  - Jones: $42
  - Pruitt: $0

*See "Notes on Methodology" for further explanation.*
MAY 13, 2003

TO: OFFICE OF BUDGET AND EVALUATION
RYAN BROWN, DIRECTOR

FROM: JUSTICE OF THE PEACE #2-1
GERRY COOPER, JUDGE

RE: 15 WEEK HIRING FREEZE

Dear Mr. Brown,

My court is losing a truancy clerk effective May 23, 2003. I would like permission to replace her immediately.

My court is the only court accepting Auto Cite cases. With the overwhelming number of cases we are handling, we do not have the staff to work those cases, let alone all of our truancy. We currently have 1 temporary at this time for Auto Cite, but we desperately need 2 more.

Thank you for your immediate attention to the matter.

Sincerely,

Gerry Cooper
Justice of the Peace
May 14, 2003

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: Ryan Brown
Budget Officer

FROM: Greg Allbright
Budget and Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Additional Public Defender for 305th Juvenile District Court

BACKGROUND
Judge Cheryl Shannon, 305th Juvenile District Court, has requested a Public Defender be authorized for her court to hear CPS-Termination cases (Attachment A). Attachment B details the currently authorized Public Defender staffing by Court. In order to accommodate this request, Chief Public Defender Jeanette Green has requested an additional Public Defender (Attachment C). The purpose of this briefing is making a recommendation on this request.

OPERATIONAL IMPACT
Currently, there are no Public Defenders authorized in either of the two Juvenile District Courts to hear CPS-Termination cases. Five Public Defenders are authorized to these courts to handle Juvenile Delinquency cases. Judge Shannon intends to appoint the Public Defender 4 to represent a child or parent in CPS-Termination cases. These cases involve the termination of parental rights over the child. Based on information provided by the Public Defender's Office, most cases involve the following: several uncontested hearings, mediations, multiple meetings with clients, relatives, CPS caseworkers, observation of parent-child visits, and, if applicable, trial preparation. Attachment D diagrams a typical CPS-Termination case from when a parent is appointed.

Based on Judge Shannon’s comments in Attachment A, she intends to appoint 8 new cases a month to the Public Defender 4. The purpose for this number is to ensure that the appointment of cases to the Public Defender be cost-effective when compared to using court appointed attorneys. An attorney familiar with these cases in the Public Defender’s office feels that a caseload of 40 per month would constitute a full-time workload. If the Commissioners Court approved the additional Public Defender 4 position for this court, they would receive 8 cases a month until they reached, or went over, this 40 case threshold. Assuming that the Public Defender 4 had no cases already, the threshold would be reached between four and five months after they began.
For one full year, the Public Defender 4 is projected to receive 88 CPS-Termination cases, being appointed to the child or the parent of the child. Table 1 below outlines the potential monthly case assignments for this Public Defender. It is assumed that the workload will be even among all twelve months, and that the cases will be disposed 6-8 months after appointment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Pending caseload</th>
<th>Hours needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

If the parent is indigent, mentally ill, or a minor they are entitled to receive a court appointed attorney. Most often an attorney is appointed to represent the child and one for both of the child’s parents. It is anticipated that the Public Defender 4 assigned to this court will receive appointments for both the child and the parents. In the Juvenile Courts, court appointed attorneys are paid $100 for each court appearance and $80 an hour for out of court time. Comparatively, a Public Defender 4 working full-time in these courts would cost $40 per hour. This figure is based on the yearly cost of this position, $72,850, divided by the number of available, or billable hours in one year, 1,736.

In FY2002, the 305th Juvenile District Court spent $1.128 million for court appointed attorneys to handle CPS-Termination cases. Due to the length of time needed to dispose of these cases, attorneys are paid throughout the life of the case. Attorneys are expected to submit pay sheets after a few hours of work, so that the judge can monitor the work performed. Due to this payment method and the varying number of attorneys appointed, it is difficult to accurately assess what is paid for one case. The cost of adding one Public Defender 4 for the remaining 4 months (starting in June) of FY2003 is approximately $24,283. Should Commissioners Court concur with the Office of Budget and Evaluation’s recommendation, funds budgeted for Court Appointed Attorneys would be transferred to the Public Defender’s budget to cover the additional cost of this position.
PERFORMANCE MEASURES
The utilization of the Public Defender's Office is reviewed and reported quarterly in the Judicial Management Report. The Office of Budget and Evaluation will provide Commissioners Court a review of the savings attributed to this Public Defender addition six months following the hire date of the position.

RECOMMENDATION
The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends the addition of a Public Defender 4 to be assigned to the 305th Juvenile District Court. The cost/benefit analysis demonstrates savings related to adding an additional Public Defender to this court. The Office of Budget and Evaluation will monitor the cost/benefits of this additional position and recommend its elimination in the future if utilizing court appointed attorneys will result in a cost savings to Dallas County.
Jeanette,  
Pursuant to our meeting today, I am supportive of your request to the Commissioner's for the addition of an attorney to your office to handle DPRS cases. As you are aware, when Kim Murhphy was hired we began appointing your office to these cases. I was not aware that she was specifically assigned to the DR courts.

It is my understanding the Kim currently has 12 cases that have been assigned from my Court over a two month period. It is further my understanding that based on your assessment, appointments averaging 8 per month will result in a significant cost savings to the County and a manageable case load for the assigned attorney. Considering our record for the two months and your confidence in a manageable case load, I will commit to appointing your office to 8 DPRS cases per month and more specifically, a case load that will average into 8 per month. It is further my understanding that Kim Murphy will be assigned to our Court. Part of my consideration in these appointments has been my confidence in Kim's ability to handle these cases.

Please provide me with monthly statistics indicating the number of appointments per month, total cases assigned currently pending and your assessment of the cost savings to the County.

Judge Shannon
# ATTACHMENT B
## Authorized Public Defender Staffing
### By Court
#### As of May 20, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Authorized PDs</th>
<th>Requested PD's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felony Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal District Court #1</td>
<td>Warder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal District Court #2</td>
<td>Stricklin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal District Court #3</td>
<td>R. Francis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal District Court #4</td>
<td>Cruezot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal District Court #5</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194th Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195th Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Nelms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203rd Criminal District Court</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204th Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Nancarrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265th Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282nd Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283rd Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291st Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292nd Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363rd Criminal District Court</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misdemeanor Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #1</td>
<td>Clancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #2</td>
<td>Pask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #3</td>
<td>Wyde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #4</td>
<td>Tailie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #5</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #6</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #7</td>
<td>Crowder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #8</td>
<td>Roden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #9</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #10</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court #11</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court of Appeals</td>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Criminal Court of Appeals #</td>
<td>Burson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Illness Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Court #3</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile/Family Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304th Juvenile District Court - JD</td>
<td>Sholden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305th Juvenile District Court - JD</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305th Juvenile District Court - CPS</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

April 28, 2003

Dallas County Commissioners Court
Administration Building
411 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75202

Re: Public Defender for CPS cases in
Judge Shannon's Court

Dear Commissioners,

Following your approval of two new family law positions in the 2003 budget hearings, I talked to Judge Shannon about using the PD's office for similar cases in the juvenile courts. The family law P.D.s were added to handle cases involving Child Protective Service and other types of terminations. These cases often require the appointment of two and sometimes up to four attorneys per case. (The appointments would be guardian ad litem's for children or once termination is sought, attorney ad litem's for each parent, to avoid conflicts of interest between the parents. Attorneys are also appointed if there is a citation by publication.)

After the new family positions were approved and I determined that the elections would not hinder me in hiring new attorneys, I posted and filled the positions with two experienced attorneys in mid-January. Judge Shannon immediately started appointing Kim Murphy, one of the new family law PD's, to cases in her Court. Currently, Ms. Murphy has received 12 CPS-type appointments from Judge Shannon in a 2-month period in addition to her family law appointments. Judge Shannon has been pleased with Ms. Murphy's performance and has decided that she would like to add a new Juvenile P.D. position to handle CPS-type cases. There is a potential to expand the P.D.s appointments to ad litem's for publications and adoption registry appointments, since we have investigators that can be beneficial in these types of appointments. I have informed Judge Shannon that I would be happy to transfer Ms. Murphy to her Court full time, if the position is created. I would then hire a new attorney for the family law position.

To determine the accurate number of cases that needs to be cost effective, I relied on the information used to create the two family law positions. I informed Judge Shannon that the family law P.D.s average 8 new CPS/termination-type cases a month. (These cases often take 12 to 18 months to resolve, so the average caseload would
increase monthly.) She agreed to this minimum and I, in turn, agreed to keep her informed of the number of appointments she gives us as well as the number of in and out-of-court hours that are worked on a monthly basis, so she can ensure that the P.D. is used cost-effectively. If one full-time CPS-type P.D. position was exclusively assigned to Judge Shannon's Court, the County would ultimately save on court-appointed attorney fees.

I would encourage the Commissioner's Court to approve this new position.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Drescher Green
Chief Public Defender
Illustration of a CPS Case - Public Defender's Office

Termination filed
Parent indigent - Attorney appointed

Child in foster care
Child with relative

Meet with client
Meet with CPS, other parties, family, etc.
Observe parent-child visit
Send discovery requests

Pretrial
Pretrial

Review CPS discovery responses
(Medical records, psych records, documentation of caseworker)

Prove-up Permanent Managing Conservator (PMC)

Look for relative

Relative found
get home-study done

Approved
Pretrial
Prove-up

Couldn't find relative

Not approved
File motion, have hearing to place child

Not Placed
Pretrial

Trial Preparation

Trial
May 14, 2003

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: Ryan Brown
Budget Officer

FROM: Sarah L. Smaardyk
Budget & Policy Analyst II

SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR FUNDS SB 1074 – VIDEO CAMERA AND RECORDING EQUIPMENT

BACKGROUND
The 77th Legislature tasked the Department of Public Safety with administering funds for the purchase of video and audio equipment for law enforcement agencies to comply with SB 1074.

SB 1074 statutorily defines and prohibits racial profiling and sets forth provisions for the implementation of policies, education and training programs, as well as the collection and reporting of certain information regarding racial profiling in the practice of law enforcement. The bill requires a law enforcement agency to examine the feasibility of installing video camera and transmitter-activated equipment in each agency law enforcement motor vehicle regularly used to make traffic stops. All of the Constable Precincts who have traffic programs as well as the Sheriff’s Office Patrol Division and Freeway Management Division have cameras in their vehicles.

On December 3, 2001, the Texas Department of Public Safety sent letters, applications and questionnaires to law enforcement agencies and requested that the application be returned to the Texas Department of Public Safety by January 31, 2002.

Although this issue was not briefed to Commissioners Court, Judge Jackson signed the application on January 31, 2002. The Department of Public Safety ranked all of the agencies that applied for the funding. The Sheriff’s Office, Warrants Division, Constable Precinct 1 and Constable Precinct 2 were all awarded cameras.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS
The following departments requested cameras and were approved cameras:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># of Cars</th>
<th># of Cameras Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office, Warrants Division*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Precinct 1, Constable Evans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Precinct 2, Constable Gothard</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of cars does not include the traffic cars.

These departments have requested that the cameras be installed in their vehicles. Dallas County policy states that “equipment purchase cost and initial installation are to be funded from the DDA” regarding equipment that has been donated, purchased with DDA funds or grant funded. These cameras were funded through the Department of Public Safety.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT/CONSIDERATIONS**

There was no cash match required by the grant. However, the departments that applied for the grant did not factor in the installation or tape costs in their FY2003 budget. As a result, funds are not available within each department’s budget.

Below is a cost breakdown for the installation of the cameras, as well as the videotape costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># of Cameras Received</th>
<th>Installation Cost</th>
<th>Tape Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>DDA Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office, Warrants Division*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$20,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Precinct 1, Constable Evans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$6,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Precinct 2, Constable Gothard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>$10,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $14,500

Note: *The installation costs for the video camera is higher for the Warrants Division because existing equipment such as radio and/or computer equipment in the trunk of the vehicles must be relocated because of the need for additional space for recorder units.

It will cost $14,500 to install the new cameras and provide tapes to record any traffic stops.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Due to the financial constrains of the FY2003 budget and the fact that the Deputies who will be receiving these cameras are not primarily responsible for performing traffic stops, the Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that the departments use their DDA funds or Drug Forfeiture Funds to install the cameras and purchase tapes.
May 14, 2003

To:        Dallas County Judge and Members of the Dallas County Commissioners Court
From:     Danny "DJ" Chandler, Director, Office of Security and Emergency Management
Subject: Texas Domestic Preparedness Assessment/Grant 2002

BACKGROUND
1. On April 14, 2003, the Office of Security and Emergency Management completed the 2002 Texas Domestic Preparedness Assessment (TDPA) for Dallas County and its mutual aid partners (see attached list). The function of this assessment was to identify shortfalls or gaps in the areas of planning, organization, equipment, training and exercises required to respond to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) terrorism incidents. There will be no need for a reassessment for approximately 2-3 years. Future grant awards will be made based on this assessment.
2. The assessment takes the place of a traditional grant application in that the assessment also serves as a grant application. It was completed online with concurrent copies submitted to the Texas Engineering Extension Service (TEEX) and the North Central Texas Council of Government (COG).
3. Grantees will be notified later this month the amount of their awards. Funds will be available in June. It should be noted that funds awarded under this grant do not require a local match and does not allow indirect cost recovery.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
1. Texas Domestic Preparedness funds originally approved $28.5m
2. Wartime supplemental appropriations -Texas (estimate) 29.3m
3. Total state funding (estimate) $57.8m

LEGAL / POLICY
1. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security, through the Office for Domestic Preparedness provided financial assistance directly to each of the nation’s states and territories through the Fiscal Year (FY) 2002.

SUMMARY
Purpose of this briefing is to make the court aware of this assessment. Once notice of award is made this item will be brought back to the court for a detailed explanation.
1. County Departments or Offices
   A. Constables
   B. Health and Human Services
   C. Public Works
   D. Sheriff
   E. Southwest Institute for Forensic Science

2. Other County Agencies
   A. Dallas Public Health District (Parkland)
   B. Dallas County Community College District
   C. Dallas County Schools

3. Other Agencies
   A. Dallas Independent School District
   B. Dallas Water District

4. Mutual Aid Cities
   A. Balch Springs
   B. Cedar Hill
   C. Cockrell Hill
   D. Duncanville
   E. Highland Park
   F. Hutchins
   G. Sachse
   H. Seagoville
   I. Sunnyvale
   J. University Park
   K. Wilmer
May 20, 2003

MISCELLANEOUS

1) **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT** - requests approval for a thirty (30) day project extension to Bonner Associates for the demolition and reconstruction projects located at 211 Dewitt and 1215 Hart, Wilmer (Bid #2003-044-1279 & Bid #2003-042-1277) and that all late fees be waived for this project. The original completion date should have been May 15, 2003 but due to the delays in getting the floor plans inverted and re-printed it is requested that the final completion date of June 15, 2003 be accepted.

2) **THE OFFICE OF BUDGET AND EVALUATION** - is notifying Commissioners Court that the position number 6331 will no longer be receiving Detention Training Officer (DTO) pay. The person assigned that position number has been transferred to the Technical Services Division and assigned a new position number, 1792, which the Sheriff's Office would like to assign DTO pay. Court Order 2002 2162-A authorized 131 Sheriff's Office employees $100 per month for performing Detention Training Officer and Fire Warden (FW) duties. Included with the Court Order were the authorized positions numbers that were to receive the supplemental pay. A total of 67 positions receive DTO/FW supplemental pay, leaving the Sheriff's Office with 64 unassigned position numbers slated to receive supplemental pay.

The Sheriff’s Office, Human Resources Division, would like to reassign the position number designated to receive supplemental pay to 1792. There is no net change to the number of people receiving DTO/FW pay.

3) **HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT** - requests:

   a) authorization for the County Treasurer, Lisa Hembry, to release payroll for the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (LIHEAP and DOE) contracts, for the months of April and May, 2003.

   b) authorization for four (4) reserved parking spaces in the Northwest corner of the 2377 Stemmons Freeway location. Funding for which is available from each respective grant budget.

   c) authorization for the Methodist Medical Center, in conjunction with the Employee Health Center, to perform Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA) blood testing, at no charge, to male employees of Dallas County, on Friday, June 13, 2003, at the George Allen Building and the Employee Health Center, in observance of National Men’s Health Week.
4) **DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE** - requests permission to renew the LexisNexis on-line subscription for the period June 1, 2003 through May 31, 2004 for the department's investigators. This service is used by the investigators to search for information on individuals (both defendants and potential witnesses). Specifically, the search engine has a special law enforcement feature that allows the investigators to perform background checks and identify prior criminal history in other jurisdictions. The annual cost of this subscription is $10,176, a reduction of $1,200 compared to the current subscription cost. Funding for this service is included in the District Attorney's approved budget. **Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.**

5) **DISTRICT COURT ADMINISTRATION** - requests authorization for reduced cost parking at the juror rate of $3.00 per day at the George L. Allen, Sr. Courts Building, Underground Parking Garage for twelve (12) law clerks that will be working pro bono for this summer.

(Please refer to Information Item No. 3)

**TRAVEL REQUESTS**

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

a) Glen Judd, Paul Cronquist and Robert Green to attend Easy Audit Training in Austin, Texas on May 20-23, 2003: $1,365.00 is available in Grant Fund, HHS/WAP Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08308.02460.2003).

b) M. Joyce Brown to attend the AARP Orientation/Training Meeting on Reverse Mortgage Counseling Project in Chicago, Illinois on May 22-23, 2003 at no cost to Dallas County.

c) Clerenda Thomas, Cristina Velez, Cynthia Hoard, Debra Triplett, Eddie Brown, Ken Carter, Lucretia Gaston, Maurice Jones, Jr., Michael Suberu, Monique Washington, Patricia Scali, Robert Norris, Susana Herrera, Udell Jasso, and Vanessa Jones to attend the Nan McKay Eligibility & Rent Calculation in Plano, Texas on June 2-6, 2003: $11,890.20 is available in Grant Fund, Section 8 Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08001.02460.2003).
d) Thomas J. Davis to conduct two STD Workshops at the request of the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences in El Dorado, Arkansas and the Zion Hill Human Services Agency in Camden, Arkansas on June 3-4, 2003: $367.00 is available in Grant Fund, STD Training/CDC Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08900.02460.2003).

e) Charlotte Hyams to attend the Planning and Response Capacity Building: Partners Resources and Realities - Texas Training Initiative for Emergency Response (T-TER) in College Station, TX on June 9-13, 2003: $1,469.00 is available in Grant Fund, OPHP/Bioterrorism Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2002, (00466.08723.02460.2002).

f) Beatriz Jusino and Anish Mathew to attend the TDH- Level B Training Workshop 2003 in Austin, TX on June 24-27, 2003: $932.20 is available in Grant Fund, Lab Bioterrorism Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08720.02460.2003).

g) Thomas J. Davis to attend the 15th Biennial Congress International Society for Sexually Transmitted Diseases Research, in Ottawa, Canada on July 24-30, 2003: $2,100.00 is available in Grant Fund, STD Training/CDC Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2003, (00466.08900.02460.2003).

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

*****

MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT

(1) DEPARTMENT: 1090 Data Services Department
ITEMS: 1 - desk
6 - chairs
Partitions

ESTIMATED COST: N/A
FUNDING SOURCE: N/A (Surplus Equipment)
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: N/A
PROPOSED ACTION: The Data Services Department requests authorization to transfer from surplus equipment one (1) desk, six (6) chairs, and partitions to be used for their Disaster
Recovery Project in the basement of George Allen building. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

(2) DEPARTMENT: County Clerk
ITEM: Postage Machine
ESTIMATED COST: $8,000
FUNDING SOURCE: Records Preservation and Management Fund
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00120.4031.08610.2003 (General Fund, County Clerk, Special Equipment, FY2003)
PROPOSED ACTION: The County Clerk is requesting to purchase a Postage Machine to process mail within their department. The District Attorney’s Office has authorized the purchase of the Postage Machine to be funded from the County Clerk’s Records Preservation and Management Fund. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation.

(3) DEPARTMENT: Sheriff’s Office, Communications
ITEMS: 6 - Dallas County Mapscos
1 - Tarrant County Mapscos
1 - Ellis County Mapscos
1 - Collin County Mapscos
1 - Denton County Mapscos
ESTIMATED COST: $322
FUNDING SOURCE: Within Budget - Sheriff’s Office, Executive Division
EXPENDITURE SOURCE: 00120.3110.02950.2003 (General Fund, Executive Division, Books & Supplements, FY2003)
PROPOSED ACTION: The Sheriff’s Office, Communications Division requests 10 Mapscos to be used in the 9-1-1 Communications Dispatch Center. The Dispatch Center responds to calls concerning life and death situations. It is important for the Communications Division to have the most up-to-date information available to them due to life safety issues. Recommended by Office of Budget and Evaluation.

**TELECOMMUNICATIONS REQUESTS**

*IT Services MD-0304034* requests to install a data-line cable to extend a SBC data circuit from the Demarcation point to the station. Installation: $87.50; no monthly service increase. **Recommended.**
Court Services - requests:
MD-0304035 to install a data-line cable on the 1st floor of the FCCB room C-11 to provide network access. Installation: $58.75; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

M-0304036 to replace an existing single-line set with a multi-line set for the new Sergeant. Equipment: $95.00; labor covered by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Purchasing M-0304039 requests to install a single-line in room 646 to support a fax machine for the department. Installation: $41.50; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Juvenile M-0304038 requests to install a multi-line phone on the 2nd floor room A277 of the Psychology Division. Equipment: $95.00; Installation: $41.50; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Elections M-0304015 requests to install a local single-line at the Sunnyvale Fire Department for use during the May Election. Installation: $116.50; monthly service increase; $35.00. Recommended.

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