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b) Revision to Court Order Authorizing JAIBG Turn Back Funds  
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13-14  
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15-19 |
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      Bid No. 2003-160-1413 ........................................ 20-25
      Page 25 Purposely Omitted
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   Request for Statements of Qualifications for Independent
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7) MIS DEPARTMENT
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   (COURT ORDER ON FORMAL AGENDA)

9) OFFICE OF BUDGET & EVALUATION
   a) Key Telephone System Replacement .......................... 53-54
   b) Conversion of CJD Grant Forensic Biologist to
      County Position ............................................. 55-56
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Dallas County’s 2003 Annual Audit Performed by KPMG, LLP ........................................ 57-96

11) **IT Long Range Plan** ........................................ N/A

12) **Major Technology Projects Review** ........................................ 97-119
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Speakers ........................................ N/A

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

Minister’s Letter of Appreciation

**DATE(s) TO REMEMBER**
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 27, 2003

To: Dallas County Commissioners Court

From: Michael K. Griffiths, Director

Re: Award of Juvenile Drug Court Program Grant

Background of Issue

The Juvenile Department has received the grant award notification from the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Drug Courts Program Office (DCPO), to assist in developing and establishing a juvenile drug court for juvenile offenders charged with drug related offenses. The Commissioners Court approved the department’s request to submit an application for funding through Court Order 2003-871 dated May 20, 2003. The Juvenile Department is currently piloting a Drug Court for misdemeanor offenders. It is believed that a drug court, to include felony offenders, will be an effective addition to our continuum of treatment services.

The purpose of this briefing is to request Commissioners Court approval to accept funding in the amount of $499,565 for a three year period.

Impact On Operations And Maintenance

For Fiscal year 2002, approximately 750 youth were referred to this department for felony and misdemeanor drug related offenses, and forty-six percent of those youth tested positive for drugs. A formal substance abuse assessment is conducted to determine the severity of the youth’s drug problem and to recommend an appropriate level of treatment. Youth are placed in an available treatment program, including those operated by the Juvenile Department, contracted providers, and community-based programs. The assigned probation officer is responsible for monitoring the youth’s progress while in treatment and taking appropriate action when the youth fails to comply with their treatment program.

The Juvenile Drug Court (JDC) will provide 6 months of intensive judicial intervention and supervision of juveniles and families involved in substance abuse. The JDC is designed...
to promote abstinence and alter behavior with a combination of incentives, escalating sanctions, mandatory drug testing, treatment, and aftercare programs. The JDC model requires the participation of the youth and family in treatment, where treatment providers can effectively focus on developing a therapeutic relationship.

The profile of youth appropriate for participation in the JDC will be youth: (1) referred for misdemeanor or felony drug charges; (2) who have had no prior adjudications; and (3) who have no history of violent behavior. A drug assessment will be conducted by the Department’s Substance Abuse Unit. Results of that assessment will then be forwarded to the JDC team, made up of the Drug Court Judge, prosecutor, public defender, treatment representative, coordinator, research specialist and school representative. Based upon the results of the assessment, the team will decide to either: (1) forward the case for random assignment to either JDC for participation, or refer for disposition under current procedures or (2) refer the case for disposition according to usual departmental practice. A recommendation can later be made to close the case/provide continuing care or proceed with formal prosecution based upon the youth’s level of success in the program.

The grant includes funding for one full-time probation officer. We are requesting that Human Resources be authorized to evaluate and grade the position for submission to the Civil Service Commission. Mr. George Ashford III will serve as the Judge for the JDC. The prosecutor and public defender will also be assigned from current staff.

The JDC grant provides a maximum of three years funding. If the program is found to be effective, the Juvenile department will assume operation from our budget by reallocating resources from other substance abuse services.

Legal Information

The Award notice requires the signature of the Director of the Juvenile Department, who is designated the authorized official for the purpose of this grant.

Financial Impact/Considerations

The grant award of $499,565 is for 75 percent of the total three year project cost of $669,673. The annual average local match of $57,000 will be met through currently budgeted funds for drug screens, drug assessments, and office space. No additional County funds are required to meet the local match requirements.

Performance Measures Impact

Recipients of implementation grants are required to conduct a process evaluation of their drug court program. Ideally, process evaluations should be conducted by an independent researcher, working in close collaboration with drug court program staff.
We have had discussions with Dr. Simon M. Fass, Associate Professor of Public Administration and Political Economy in the School of Social Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas (UTD), to serve as the project’s independent evaluator. Dr. Fass has extensive experience in program evaluation and design.

Youth who are eligible for the drug court will be randomly assigned to the drug court or the control group. Youth in the control group will continue to receive substance abuse services following current practices, but will not participate in the drug court program.

The JDC is targeted to serve 100 youth annually. The following performance measures will be tracked to evaluate overall program success:

1. The number of youth who successfully complete their treatment plan objectives, with a goal of a sixty percent successful discharge rate.

2. The number of youth who abstain from drug use as evidenced by urine screens. We predict that youth in the JDC program will have a 15% lower incidence of positive urine screens than youth in the control group.

3. The number of youth who successfully complete the program and then commit a new drug offense. We predict a 10% lower recidivism rates for youth who successfully discharge from the JDC compared to youth in the control group.

**Project Schedule/Implementation**

We anticipate a project start date of November 17, 2003.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Dallas County Commissioners Court approve the Juvenile Department’s request to accept the grant award of $499,565 from the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, for the implementation of a juvenile drug court program for Dallas County and authorize the Director of the Juvenile Department to sign the grantee acceptance notice on behalf of Dallas County. It is also recommended that the Court authorize the Dallas County Human Resources/Civil Services to submit the funded probation officer position to the Civil Service Commission for classification.

Recommended by:  
Michael K. Griffiths, Director
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2600 Lone Star Drive, Box 5  Dallas, Texas 75212  (214) 698-2200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. RECIPIENT NAME AND ADDRESS (Including Zip Code)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Juvenile Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Lone Star Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX 75212-6332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. AWARD NUMBER:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-DC-BX-0046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. PROJECT PERIOD:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM 09/01/2003 TO 08/31/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. AWARD DATE:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/01/2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. ACTION:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>11. TOTAL AWARD:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$499,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12. SPECIAL CONDITIONS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE ABOVE GRANT PROJECT IS APPROVED SUBJECT TO SUCH CONDITIONS OR LIMITATIONS AS ARE SET FORTH ON THE ATTACHED 2 PAGE(S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13. STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR GRANT:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project is supported under Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, Pub. L. No. 90-351, Title I, 82 stat. 197 (1968), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>18. TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED GRANTEE OFFICIAL:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Griffiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Services Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>19A. DATE:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>21. ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION CODES:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X B DC 80 00 00 499565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The recipient agrees to comply with the financial and administrative requirements set forth in the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Financial Guide.

2. The recipient acknowledges that failure to submit an acceptable Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (if recipient is required to submit one pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Section 42.302), that is approved by the Office for Civil Rights, is a violation of its Certified Assurances and may result in suspension or termination of funding, until such time as the recipient is in compliance.

3. The recipient agrees to comply with the organizational audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations, as further described in the current edition of the OJP Financial Guide, Chapter 19.

4. The recipient agrees to cooperate with any assessments, national evaluation efforts, or information or data collection requests, including, but not limited to, the provision of any information required for the assessment or evaluation of any activities within this project.

5. The recipient agrees to ensure that the State Information Technology Point of Contact receives written notification regarding any information technology project funded by this grant during the obligation and expenditure period. This is to facilitate communication among local and state governmental entities regarding various information technology projects being conducted with these grant funds. In addition, the recipient agrees to maintain an administrative file documenting the meeting of this requirement. For a list of State Information Technology Points of Contact, go to http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/eclstates.htm.

6. Grantee agrees to comply with the requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 46 and all Office of Justice Programs policies and procedures regarding the protection of human research subjects, including obtainment of Institutional Review Board approval, if appropriate, and subject informed consent.

7. Grantee agrees to comply with all confidentiality requirements of 42 U.S.C. section 3789g and 28 C.F.R. Part 22 that are applicable to collection, use, and revelation of data or information. Grantee further agrees, as a condition of grant approval, to submit a Privacy Certificate that is in accord with requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 22 and, in particular, section 22.23.

8. The recipient agrees to develop and maintain a Drug Court Policies and Procedures manual for program operations. By the end of the first year of the grant period, the manual must be included as part of the recipient's grant file and be available for Bureau of Justice Assistance review upon request.

9. Recipient agrees to submit a written strategy describing the jurisdiction's plan for sustaining the adult, juvenile, tribal, or family drug court program after Federal financial assistance has ended. The sustainability plan must be submitted by the end of the first year of the grant period in order to be in compliance with this requirement.

10. Recipient agrees to submit an evaluation plan for review and approval within 180 days from the date of acceptance of this award. The recipient agrees to submit finalized evaluation report(s) to the Bureau of Justice Assistance prior to the end of the grant period.
12. Grantee agrees that assistance funds awarded under this grant will not be used to support any inherently religious activities, such as worship, religious instruction, or proselytization. If the grantee refers participants to, or provides, a non-Federally funded substance abuse treatment program or service that incorporates such religious activities, (1) any such activities must be voluntary for drug treatment program participants, and (2) drug treatment program participants may not be excluded from participation in a drug treatment program or otherwise penalized or disadvantaged for any failure to accept a referral or services. If participation in a non-Federally funded substance abuse treatment program or service that incorporates inherently religious activities is deemed a critical treatment or support service for program participants, the grantee agrees to identify and refer participants who object to the inherently religious activities of such program or service to, or provide, a comparable secular alternative treatment program or service.

13. Recipient agrees not to conduct program activities, as described in its application for funding consideration, until the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs (BJA), has reviewed and approved the Program Narrative portion of the application and has issued a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN) informing recipient of the approval. Accordingly, reimbursement with federal funds for program activities conducted by recipient prior to receipt of BJA approval may be denied if such activities are later determined to be unallowable.
Date: October 28, 2003
To: Dallas County Commissioners Court
From: Michael K. Griffiths, Director of Administrative Services
Subject: Same Day Briefing and Court Order

Permission is requested for a miscellaneous briefing and Court Order correcting an error in Commissioners Court Order No. 2003-1048 to avoid a delay in reimbursing the Town of Addison for JAIBG turn back funds.
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 28, 2003
To: Dallas County Commissioners Court
From: Michael K. Griffiths, Director of Administrative Services
Subject: Revision to Court Order Authorizing JAIBG Turn Back Funds

Commissioners Court Order No. 2003-1048 on June 17, 2003 authorized the allocation of "turn back" funds from the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) to the jurisdictions participating in the Dallas County Juvenile Information System (JIS) project. These funds are used by the jurisdictions to purchase hardware, software, or related services needed to access the JIS. There was a typographical error on the Court Order for the Town of Addison, whose allocation should be $2,915.75 instead of the $2,195.75 listed on the order. A Court Order has been prepared correcting the error and is on the formal agenda for Court approval.

Submitted by: Michael K. Griffiths, Director of Juvenile Services
COURT ORDER

ORDER NO: ______________________

DATE: ______________________

STATE OF TEXAS   }

COUNTY OF DALLAS   }

BE IT REMEMBERED at a regular meeting of the Dallas County Commissioners Court, held on the

_______________ day of ________________________________ 2003, on a motion made

by ______________________________, and seconded

by ______________________________, the following Order was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dallas County Commissioners Court was briefed on November 4, 2003 about the
requirement for a revision to Court Order No. 2003-1048, which approved the allocation of
Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) "turn back" funds to the cities that
participate in the Dallas County Juvenile Information System (JIS) project; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Addison is allocated $2,915.75 in "turn back" funds; and

WHEREAS, due to a typographical error, Court Order No. 2003-1048 listed the Town of Addison as
receiving $2,195.75 in "turn back" funds.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the Commissioners Court of Dallas County
amends Court Order No. 2003-1048 to allocate $2,915.75 in Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant
"turn back" funds to the Town of Addison.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this the ____________ day of ________________________________ 2003.

Margaret Keliher, County Judge    Jim Jackson, District #1    Mike Cantrell, District #2

John Wiley Price, District #3    Kenneth A. Mayfield, District #4

Recommended By: ____________________________
Michael K. Griffiths, Director
Dallas County Juvenile Department
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DALLAS COUNTY
HUMAN RESOURCES/CIVIL SERVICE

Date: October 29, 2003
To: Members of Commissioners Court
From: Mattye Mauldin-Taylor, Ph.D., Director
Subject: Request for Temporary Exception to the Residence Requirement – Institute of Forensic Science

Background
The Institute of Forensic Science is requesting a temporary exception to the Residence Policy (Dallas County Code, Sec. 86-191 to 86-200) for a candidate selected for the position of Chief Field Agent. The candidate resides in Denton, Texas, in Denton County. The temporary exception would allow the candidate an opportunity to relocate to Dallas County. The selected candidate fully intends to comply with the Dallas County residence requirement within twelve months of employment.

The Institute has determined that the selected candidate is the best fit for the position.

Impact on Operations
Any continued vacancy for this position will adversely affect the objectives set by the Institute of Forensic Science.

Financial Impact
There is no additional financial impact associated with this request.

Recommendation
The Human Resources Department recommends Commissioners Court approve a temporary exception to the Residence Policy for a period not to exceed twelve (12) months. This will allow the candidate ample time to relocate to Dallas County. If the residence requirement has not been satisfied by the end of the twelve (12) month period, the employee would be terminated from the position of Chief Field Agent.

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

Attachment

501 Main Street
Records Building
Dallas, Texas
Equal Opportunity Employer 214.653.7638
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Forensic Sciences requests a temporary exemption from the residency requirement for the position of Chief Field Agent, grade I, position number 1521. We request the standard, temporary exemption stated in County policy of 3 months after completion of probation or nine months from date of hire.

Paul Gaubatz is the unanimous recommendation of our five member interview committee and was selected for hire by Dr. Barnard. Mr. Gaubatz is currently on detachment as a civilian in the military in New Mexico; his family resides in Denton. Mr. Gaubatz has agreed to move to Dallas County if hired.

Mr. Gaubatz retired from the military after 21 years and has worked as a civilian in the Office of Special Investigations for the last four years. He has approximately 15 years of supervisory and investigative (including death investigation) experience.

Although there were other qualified candidates who currently reside within Dallas County, none offer the combination of extensive investigative and supervisory experience exhibited by Mr. Gaubatz.

We would like to hire Mr. Gaubatz beginning on November 5, 2003. This should allow consideration of this request by the Commissioners Court on November 4, 2003. Please advise me immediately if this time schedule is not feasible.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Todd
214-920-5990

CC: Cathy Self, Jeffrey Barnard
Date: October 29, 2003

To: Members of the Commissioners Court

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

Subject: Juvenile Department Requests

Request for New Employee
Request for exception to the Compensation Policy/Salary above Minimum

Background
Michael K. Griffiths, Director of the Juvenile Department has submitted a request to (1) hire a retired employee for a part-time Contracts Officer, and (2) pay the part-time employee up to the maximum in-hire rate, based on the employee’s education and previous Dallas County work experience. The part-time position is for a Special Needs Grant program, approved by the Juvenile Board, for the period September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004. Section 86-136(b1) of the Dallas County Code states that all part-time/temporary positions will be compensated at the minimum of the salary range, unless an exception is granted by Commissioners Court.

The County has approved similar requests in the past from other departments when the arrangement appeared beneficial to the department.

Impact on Operations
Approval of this request will allow the Juvenile Department to hire an employee on a part-time basis (16 hours per week) for a Special Needs Diversionary Program. The retired employee has worked as a Contracts Officer for the Juvenile Department over five (5) years and would require no additional training.

Financial Impact
There is no additional financial impact associated with this request. Funds will be paid from the Special Needs Grant program in the amount of $23,968, for the period September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004. The salary range for the Contracts Officer, Grade D, is $15.45 for the minimum and $18.54 for the maximum hiring rate.

Recommendation
The Human Resources/Civil Service Department does not recommend approval of this request because it does not comply with Section 86-136(b1) of the Dallas County Code regarding compensation of part-time/temporary positions. However, the Human Resources/Civil Service Department respectfully submits this request to Commissioners Court for further consideration.

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

Attachments

501 Main Street
Records Building
Dallas, Texas
Equal Opportunity Employer 214.653.7638
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MEMORANDUM

Date: October 21, 2003

To: Dr. Mattye Mauldin-Taylor

From: Michael K. Griffiths

Subject: Part-Time Help for the Special Needs Program

The Juvenile Department has received funding from the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) for a part-time position under the Special Needs Grant (Fund 466, Dept 7116) program. Funding in the amount of $23,968 is for the period of September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004.

The position will facilitate transfer of data between the TJPC database and Case Worker files and assist with the generation of all programmatic and statistical reports required by the grant. The position will also develop an audit program to ensure compliance with case file standards. The incumbent will be required to prepare and ready all files for reviews and audit.

We have identified a retired employee who is willing to accept this position. We are requesting that this person be allowed to be hired at the maximum in hire rate for Grade D position. Hiring the retiree will enable us to employ an experienced person who is familiar with the functions of this job and will require no additional training.

We are hereby requesting your approval to hire a part-time grade D position through the Special Needs Grant program. Please call J.P at (214) 698-4326 if you any questions or need additional information.
Dallas County Employment Application

Please read the following before completing the employment application. Applicants are considered without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or disability. All questions must be answered. You may include your resume. However, resumes will not be accepted as a substitute for applications. Please type or print clearly (black or blue ink). Applications are screened and forwarded to hiring departments based solely on the information provided herein.

### Position Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTS OFFICER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Requisition Number

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Department Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUVENILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SECTION I - PERSONAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have a driver's license?</th>
<th>☐ YES</th>
<th>☐ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Issued:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION II - OTHER EMPLOYMENT-RELATED INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you legally entitled to work in the U.S.?</th>
<th>☐ YES</th>
<th>☐ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is an adult, have you ever been convicted of anything other than a minor traffic violation?</td>
<td>☐ YES (Must attach details)</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been denied a security bond?</td>
<td>☐ YES (Must attach details)</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever worked under a different name?</td>
<td>☐ YES</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered "YES" to any of the above questions, please provide detailed explanation.

### SECTION III - EDUCATION AND TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>Diploma?</th>
<th>Graduated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HANDLEY</td>
<td>FT WORTH, TX</td>
<td>☒ YES</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>Graduated?</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT ARLINGTON</td>
<td>ARLINGTON, TX</td>
<td>☒ YES</td>
<td>ENGR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. OF NORTH TEXAS</td>
<td>DENTON, TX</td>
<td>☒ YES</td>
<td>ADMIN MGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade School</th>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>Graduated?</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒ YES</td>
<td>ABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒ YES</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATION: ☐ YES ☐ NO
at any paid internships which were not part of your degree plan. Provide a description of your internship which includes your internship dates.

N/A

at any job-related certificates, certifications, licenses that you have and the dates issued. Current ☐ yes ☐ no

NO LICENSE REQ'D

at any machines or equipment that you are qualified and experienced to operate.

GANG INTERVENTION (DPI), LOTUS, WORD PERFECT, EXCEL

MISC. WORD COUNTY TENNIS

PC, MAC ADD, P.C., SCANNER, ETC

Do you speak? ☐ read ☐ write ☐ any languages other than English? ☐ yes ☐ no

"YES", INDICATE LANGUAGES

Language A Language B Language C

Are you a male between the ages of 18 and 26? ☐ yes ☐ no (If yes, must show proof of selective service)

Are you registered with Selective Service? ☐ yes ☐ no

SECTION IV - WORK EXPERIENCE (PROVIDE ADDITIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE SHEET, IF NEEDED)

NAME OF EMPLOYER

DALLAS COUNTY

JUVENILE DEPT

TYPE OF BUSINESS

CO, GOVT

NAME OF SUPERVISOR

TELEPHONE NUMBER

PART-TIME ☐

STARTING TITLE

CONTR. OFFICER

ENDING TITLE

CONTR. OFFICER

REASON FOR LEAVING

RETIRED 6-30-03

STAINED DESCRIPTION OF JOB DUTIES.

AUDIT ALL NON-RES AGENCIES WRITE DETAILED REPORT, ASSESS FINES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE, IF YES, AUDIT JUV. DEPT. INVOICES, SITE PETTY CASHIER - BUS PASSES INTERPRETERS & BIRTH CERTIFICATION, ASSIST WITH ANNUAL BUDGET AND SERVICE PROVIDER CONTRACT

NAME OF EMPLOYER

DALLAS COUNTY

AUDITORS

TYPE OF BUSINESS

CO, GOVT

NAME OF SUPERVISOR

TELEPHONE NUMBER

PART-TIME ☐

STARTING TITLE

WORKERS COMP

ENDING TITLE

ACCT'S PAY SUPV

REASON FOR LEAVING

ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITY

STAINED DESCRIPTION OF JOB DUTIES.

SUPERVISE UP TO 6 A/P CLERKS IN PAYING COUNTY BILLS, APPROVAL CYCLE, REPORTS, CLOSER.
NAME OF EMPLOYER: Texas Instruments, Inc.  
TYPE OF BUSINESS: Defense Electronics  
ADDRESS: 19500 N. Central (5 Various Loc.)  
TELEPHONE NUMBER:  
NAME OF SUPERVISOR:  
FULL-TIME:  
STARTING TITLE: OVERHEAD CLK  
ENDING TITLE: ENGR ADMIN  
REASON FOR LEAVING: DEFENSE ELEC. TO BE SOLD  
STARTING SALARY:  
ENDING SALARY:  
DATES (M/O/YR): 4/88 4/91  
STATED DESCRIPTION OF JOB DUTIES: DEPT. BUDGETS & FORECASTS  
EQUIPMENT PROCUREMENT REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS  
NAME OF EMPLOYER:  
TYPE OF BUSINESS:  
ADDRESS:  
TELEPHONE NUMBER:  
NAME OF SUPERVISOR:  
FULL-TIME:  
STARTING TITLE:  
ENDING TITLE:  
REASON FOR LEAVING:  
STARTING SALARY:  
ENDING SALARY:  
DATES (M/O/YR):  
STATED DESCRIPTION OF JOB DUTIES:  

I certify that all information provided in this application is true and correct, and that any misrepresentation may be grounds for termination. I understand that employment offer is contingent upon verification of all documentation as may be required by Dallas County. I authorize Dallas County to contact the person(s) listed in the application, and further authorize the release of any and all information that may be relevant to this application. I hereby release Dallas County and any entity which releases information about me to Dallas County, from any reasonable actions taken in verifying this application or conducting a criminal background check. I understand that acceptance of this application by Dallas County will result in it becoming an official document subject to public disclosure under Texas Public Information Act.

By signing this application, I agree to the terms and conditions of the Employment Agreement. If applicable, I authorize investigation of all information contained in this application for employment. I understand that the information contained in this document is complete and that any misrepresentation, falsification, or willful omission herein shall be sufficient reason for dismissal or refusal of employment. I understand that any employment with this organization is contingent upon my satisfactory reference review, medical examination, criminal background, and pre-employment drug screen, if applicable.

I have read and understood the above terms.

I hereby authorize Dallas County permission to contact any previous employer(s) listed on this application for the purpose of reference checks, unless otherwise noted in this document. I also grant permission to any such previous employer to disclose any and all information concerning my previous employment. By submitting this application, I have read and understood the above terms.

I understand that I may be required to provide additional information regarding my social security number and driver’s license for verification purposes.
November 4, 2003

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Mary Stephens, Buyer
SUBJECT: Annual Contract for Body Armor – Bid No. 2003-160-1413

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

The Purchasing Department opened the Annual Contract for Body Armor on September 29, 2003 as authorized by the Commissioners Court. Two bids were received with bid pricing for the estimated 250 pieces of body armor as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Armor Bid</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Public Safety Equipment</td>
<td>Protective Products, Inc.</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$56,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Public Safety Supply, Inc.</td>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>$277.70</td>
<td>$69,425.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid also includes a bid item for an extra carrier for the armor. The additional cost for the estimated 50 carriers to be purchased is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Carrier</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
<th>Total Annual $ (Including Carrier)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Public Safety Equipment</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
<td>$5,450.00</td>
<td>$61,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Public Safety Supply, Inc.</td>
<td>$ 59.88</td>
<td>$2,994.00</td>
<td>$72,419.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid is not being recommended for award to the lowest vendor, American Public Safety Equipment for the following reason.

The document from Protective Products International (Distributors for American Public Safety Equipment) did not contain information on the ballistic integrity and construction of the vest. On the compliance report submitted by American Public Safety Equipment, there is information handwritten on the report that states what the V50 is. There is no way to tell where the information came from or what round the V50 was calculated on as the 9mm and 40 caliber are both listed on the report. There is a separate report that is entitled “V50 Ballistic Limit Test” that has the V50 calculated on the report. A copy of a V50 ballistic report is attached.

Also attached is the “Foreword” from the National Institute of Justice’s report on the NIJ0101.03 and NIJ0101.04 standards.

Secondly, the specifications required both a male and female vest for proper fitting. The female sample submitted by Protective Products International has a female carrier but the ballistic panel is a standard panel without darts, which will not properly fit females. This will result in the vest panel being pushed outward, creating gaps and reducing the side ballistic protection of the vest.

Based on the above, the Purchasing Department in conjunction with the Sheriff’s Department recommend the award to Dallas Public Safety Supply, Inc. (second low bidder) for the Second Chance SMF-IIA which
is deemed to be the best bid meeting contract specifications. In addition, it is the same vest used by the Sheriff’s Department over the past several years and meets all bid requirements.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Should the Commissioners Court concur with awarding Bid No. 2003-160-1413 to the lowest and best bidder, Dallas Public Safety, Dallas County will incur additional expenditures of $10,719.00.

RECOMMENDATION

The product bid by the lowest bidder, American Public Safety Equipment, is non-compliant with bid specifications regarding the V-50 report. As a result, the Purchasing Department in conjunction with the Sheriff’s Department recommends award to the best bidder, Dallas Public Safety Supply, Inc. for a total estimated annual cost of $72,419.00.

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

Approved by:

[Signature]
Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director

c: Gary Lindsey, Chief, Sheriff’s Dept.

File
UNITED STATES TEST LABORATORY
V50 BALLISTIC LIMIT TEST

Date Received: 7/18/00
Record No: KBS0003
Via: UPS
Test Date: 7/19/00
Returned Via: UPS
Customer: Kinematix

Sample
Manufacturer: Kinematix
Size: 20"x15"
No. of Piles: N/A
Thickness: 0.370"
Weight: 4.47 lb.
Temperature: 77 deg. F.
Sample No: C

BALLISTIC THREAT
Projectile: 9 mm
Powder: Power Pistol
Barrel Lnth: 10 in.
Obliquity: 0 deg.

Range
Muzzle to Ser. 1: 5.0 ft.
Screen 1 - 2: 4.92 ft.
Screen 2 - Target: 5.0 ft.
Target to Witness: 0.5 ft.
Midpoint to Target: 7.5 ft
Witness Panel: 2024 T3 Aluminum Range: 1

Chronograph 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHOT No.</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>TIME (ms)</th>
<th>VELOCITY (fps)</th>
<th>VELOCITY (fps)</th>
<th>AVERAGE VELOCITY (fps)</th>
<th>Loss</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>333.6</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>221.8</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>y/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>327.9</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>y/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>319.4</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>212.3</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>y/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>309.5</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>y/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>310.0</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>206.1</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>y/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>311.8</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>207.3</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>y/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>311.6</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>207.2</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>y/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>321.8</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>y/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>329.9</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>219.3</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>y/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>307.9</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>204.7</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>y/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test was performed in accordance with the specification requirements and the results properly reflect the ballistic performance of the listed sample.

REMARKS/NOTES
Humidity 55%

Sample Description:
Layer 1: Black plastic (Thickness: 0.070")
Layer 2: Rigid woven aramid fiber (Thickness: 0.230")
Layer 3: Black plastic (Thickness: 0.070")

Newman/Arnold
U.S. Test Laboratory, 3448 N. Emporia, Wichita, KS 67219
Phone 316-832-1600 Fax 316-832-1602
FOREWORD

This document, NIJ Standard–0101.04, "Ballistic Resistance of Personal Body Armor," is an equipment standard developed by the Office of Law Enforcement Standards (OLES) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). It is produced as part of the Law Enforcement and Corrections Standards and Testing Program of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ).

This standard is a technical document that specifies the performance requirements that equipment should meet to satisfy the needs of criminal justice agencies for high quality service. While purchasers can use the test methods described in this standard to determine whether a particular piece of equipment meets the essential requirements, users are encouraged to have this testing conducted only in properly accredited laboratories. Procurement officials may also refer to this standard in their purchasing documents and require that equipment offered for purchase meet its requirements. Compliance with the requirements of this standard may be attested to by an independent laboratory or guaranteed by the vendor.

Because this standard is designed as a procurement aid, it provides precise and detailed test methods. For those who seek general guidance concerning the selection and application of law enforcement and corrections equipment, user guides have also been published. The guides explain in nontechnical language how to select equipment capable of the level of performance required by a purchasing agency.

NIJ STANDARD–0101.04 IS NOT INTENDED TO RESTRICT OR OTHERWISE INFLUENCE THE PROCUREMENT AND USE OF NIJ STANDARD–0101.03 COMPLIANT BODY ARMORS. THE PUBLICATION AND USE OF THIS REVISION FOR NEW MODEL COMPLIANCE TESTING DOES NOT INVALIDATE OR RENDER UNSUITABLE ANY BODY ARMOR MODELS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED TO BE COMPLIANT USING NIJ STANDARD–0101.03 REQUIREMENTS.

NIJ standards are subjected to continuing research, development, testing, change, and review. This standard and its successors will be reevaluated annually for success in achieving the technical goals of this revision. These reviews will be based on data collected through the Compliance Testing Program and its certified test laboratories, as well as from valid comments from the user and manufacturing communities. Technical comments and recommended revisions are welcome. Please send all written comments and suggestions to the Director, Office of Science and Technology, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th St., NW, Washington, DC 20531.
(c) Size (if custom fitted, provision for the name of the individual for whom it is made).
(d) Lot number.
(e) Date of manufacture.
(f) Date of issue line (to be filled in by user).
(g) A model designation that uniquely identifies the panel for purchasing purposes (panels designed to fit the male and female torsos shall have separate model designations).
(h) Strike face or wear face - the surface of the garment that is to face the threat or to be worn next to the body must be identified.
(i) Serial number.
(j) Care instructions for the ballistic material in accordance with 16 CFR 423 (Part 423, Care Labeling of Textile Wearing Apparel and Certain Piece Goods, as amended effective January 2, 1984; Federal Trade Commission Regulation Rule).
(k) For Type I through Type IIIA armor, a warning in type at least twice the size of the rest of the type on the label, exclusive of the information required in "a" above, stating that the armor is not intended to protect the wearer from rifle fire and, if applicable, that the armor is not intended to protect the wearer from sharp edged or pointed instruments. (Note: printing color changes are acceptable but cannot be substituted for the type size requirement herein).
(l) For armor that has been successfully tested for compliance to this standard through NIJ's voluntary CTP at an NIJ-approved testing facility, the following statement shall be included on the label: "The Manufacturer certifies that this model of armor has been tested through NLECTC and has been found to comply with Type (insert appropriate type designation) Performance for NIJ Standard-0101.04."
(m) THE COMPLIANCE STATEMENT ABOVE SHALL NOT APPEAR ON ARMOR THAT HAS FAILED NIJ COMPLIANCE TESTING, OR ON ARMOR THAT HAS NOT BEEN TESTED FOR COMPLIANCE AS SPECIFIED BY THIS STANDARD. ONCE AUTHORIZED TO PLACE THIS STATEMENT ON A MODEL OF ARMOR, THE MANUFACTURER SHALL NOT ALTER OR MODIFY THIS STATEMENT IN ANY WAY.
Page 25 Purposely Omitted
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court
FROM: Scott McDowell, Senior Buyer

BACKGROUND/ISSUE

The Dallas County Fire Marshal has requested a contract extension for Bid No. 2003-013-1241, Annual Contract for Ambulance Service, as awarded to Texas Lifeline Corp. The contract provides for emergency ambulance service in the unincorporated areas of southeastern Dallas County. In accordance with contract terms and with mutual agreement by all parties, the contract may be extended for an additional twelve month period based on the original pricing, terms and conditions set forth in the Bid award. As a result of the company's good performance and compliance with contract requirements, the Dallas County Fire Marshal is requesting that the contract be extended for an additional twelve month period.

INSURANCE AND MWBE REQUIREMENTS

Texas Lifeline Corp. is in compliance with insurance requirements and a Vendor Statistical Report is attached for the Court's review.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

As of 12/02, Dallas County has spent approximately $97,000 for this service. Each service run cost $420.00.

RECOMMENDATION

The Purchasing Department, in conjunction with the Dallas County Fire Marshal, recommends the extension of Bid No. 2003-013-1241, Annual Contract for Ambulance Service, with Texas Lifeline Corp. for a twelve month period beginning December 11, 2003 through December 10, 2004 at an estimated annual cost of $97,000.00.

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

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director/sm

509 Main Street, Suite 623
Dallas, Texas 75202-4616
6th Floor Records Building
Office (214) 653-7431
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>HISPANO</td>
<td>NATIVE</td>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>7</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Coord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Male)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers (Senior/Exempt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Exempt)</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | FEMALE        |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|               | WHITE         | BLACK     | HISPANO   | NATIVE    | ASIAN     | ASIAN     | INDIAN    | OTHER     |
| Office Manager| 3             | 1         |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Professionals |               |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Managers (Male)| | | | | | | | |
| Laborers (Exempt) | | | | | | | | |
| Service Workers |               |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| TOTAL          | 2             | 1         | 3         |           |           |           |           |           |

|               | TOTAL         |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|               |               |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|               |               |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |

|               | CHECK ONE:     |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|               | Minority-Owned Firm Certification | | | | | | | |
|               | Woman-Owned Firm Certification | | | | | | | |
|               | Non-Minority Owned Firm | | | | | | | |

Signature Date: 10/20/03
Typed Name and Title: Leticia Lane, Business Office Manager
TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court  
FROM: Scott McDowell, Senior Buyer  
SUBJECT: Sole Source Purchase of a BAX PCR System  

BACKGROUND/ISSUE  
The Texas Department of Health is funding Dallas County Health and Human Services for bioterrorism readiness. This funding includes the purchase of a BAX PCR System. This instrument is used to detect food borne pathogens in the event of a food borne outbreak caused by a bioterrorism incident (or any other incident).  

The Texas Department of Health has stipulated the instrument must be a BAX PCR System in order to be compatible with protocols of the Laboratory Response Network (LRN) program which is a national consortium of laboratories providing immediate testing in the event of a public health emergency, particularly in response to acts of bioterrorism.  

Qualicon Inc. has been identified as the sole source provider for the purchase of the BAX PCR System. The BAX PCR System is proprietary to Qualicon Inc. and they sell the instrument direct to their customers as opposed to having distributors sell the instrument.  

FINANCIAL IMPACT  
The acquisition cost of the BAX PCR System is $35,000.00 and includes all the equipment, start-up supplies, training and one year service coverage. The reagent kits cost $816.00 each and test for Salmonella, L. monocytogenes, Genus Listeria and E. coli. The quantity of reagent kits purchased will depend on the number of occurrences of an event. The State of Texas is funding this purchase.  

RECOMMENDATION  
Qualicon, Inc. has been identified as the only vendor able to sell the BAX PCR System and the Texas Department of Health is requiring the purchase and placement of this instrument for Texas LRN laboratories. In accordance with Texas Local Government Code 262.024(a)(7)(A), it is the recommendation of the Purchasing Department, in conjunction with the Health and Human Services Department, that Qualicon, Inc. be awarded the purchase of a BAX PCR System at an acquisition cost of $35,000.00, with reagent kits at a cost of $816.00 each, based on a sole source award.  

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

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL  

Phillip J. Vasquez, Purchasing Director  

509 Main Street, Suite 623  
6th Floor Records Building  
Dallas, Texas 75202-4616  
Office (214) 653-7431
October 15, 2003

Dr. Edward Bannister
Dallas County Health and Human Services
2377 N. Stemmons Fwy.
Dallas, Tx  75207-2710

Dear Dr. Bannister,

The Laboratory Response Network (LRN) is a national consortium of laboratories that provides immediate and sustained laboratory testing and communication in the event of public health emergencies, particularly in response to acts of bioterrorism. One of the goals is to work with state and federal Departments and Agencies to ensure a successful Federal response to an act of bioterrorism and to facilitate and optimize the ability of the State to competently respond independently to biocrimes or public health emergencies in the State. The Texas LRN accomplishes this by promoting CDC and HHS’ bioterrorism research agenda and CDC’s internal response need.

The Texas Department of Health has worked with the CDC to provide complete, accurate, and standardized protocols for all levels of testing for agents deemed critical; a secure but easily accessible supply of standardized reagents and controls produced and approved by CDC; and training and proficiency testing necessary to accomplish any level of testing or response.

In the Cooperative Agreement on Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism for Fiscal Year 2004, Critical Benchmark #12 requires the LRN to complete and implement an integrated response plan that directs how public health food testing laboratories will respond to a bioterrorism incident or a food borne outbreak linked to an unusual food vehicle. The Texas Department of Health has addressed this benchmark by providing funding through the FY 04 Bioterrorism grant contract and requiring all LRN laboratories to purchase a BAX PCR System for food testing. A food workshop to train LRN personnel in standardized laboratory food testing methods and report systems was held in Austin July 28 through August 1 2003. This standardized testing system provides the LRN with the ability to rapidly respond to incidents and more
importantly provides surge capacity and back up for the Texas laboratory system.

The Texas Department of Health Bureau of Laboratories looks forward to working with you during the upcoming year. For technical or project assistance, please contact Rahsaan Drumgoole at (512) 458-7185, rahsaan.drumgoole@tdh.state.tx.us or Jennifer Simmank at (512) 458-7605, jennifer.simmank@tdh.state.tx.us.

Sincerely,

Susan U. Neill, Ph.D.
Chief, Bureau of Laboratories
From: "David L. Sallee" <David.L.Sallee@usa.dupont.com>
To: <smcdowell@dallascounty.org>
Date: Tue, Oct 14, 2003 1:58 PM
Subject: Dallas County - BAX instrument sole source justification

Scott:

DuPont Qualicon is the sole source and supplier of the BAX(r) System within the United States, we do not use distributors in the U.S.

(See attached file: SAX Sole Source.doc)

Let us know if there is anything else we can provide, to help you expedite the purchase order, and have the ability to take advantage of the free shipping, valued at $865 +, before the end of October.

Thanks,

Dave

David Sallee
Sr. Account Manager, DuPont Qualicon
103 White Rock Bluff, Reeds Spring, MO 65737 USA
Voice (417) 338 2696 Fax (417) 338 2706 Cell (515) 240 3258
David.L.Sallee@usa.dupont.com

This communication is for use by the intended recipient and contains information that may be privileged, confidential or copyrighted under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby formally notified that any use, copying or distribution of this e-mail, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system. Unless explicitly and conspicuously designated as "E-Contract Intended", this e-mail does not constitute a contract offer, a contract amendment, or an acceptance of a contract offer. This e-mail does not constitute a consent to the use of sender's contact information for direct marketing purposes or for transfers of data to third parties.

Francais Deutsch Italiano Espanol Portugues Japanese Chinese Korean

From: "Lance F Bolton" <Lance.F.Bolton@usa.dupont.com>
To: <Scmcdowell@dallascounty.org>
Date: Tue, Oct 28, 2003 3:16 PM
Subject: Requested Information

---------------------- Forwarded by Lance F Bolton/AE/DuPont on 10/28/2003 03:56 PM ---------------------------

Lance F Bolton
10/28/2003 03:31 PM

To: Scmcdowell@dallascounty.org
cc:
Subject: Requested Information

Scott,

Thanks for your time on the phone today. In reference to our discussion: DuPont DuPont is committed to a program of affirmative action to assure that minorities, women and other protected classes are encouraged to seek employment with the Company and to strive for advancement. DuPont does not provide any type of employee information to outside parties. The company will not even provide organizational charts for instance. There are many reasons for this policy including protecting employees and their privacy.

Best Regards,
Lance Bolton
DuPont Qualicon
(706) 769-6455

This communication is for use by the intended recipient and contains information that may be privileged, confidential or copyrighted under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby formally notified that any use, copying or distribution of this e-mail, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system. Unless explicitly and conspicuously designated as "E-Contract Intended", this e-mail does not constitute a contract offer, a contract amendment, or an acceptance of a contract offer. This e-mail does not constitute a consent to the use of sender's contact information for direct marketing purposes or for transfers of data to third parties.

Francais Deutsch Italiano Espanol Portugues Japanese Chinese Korean

EMPLOYEES OF DUPONT NUTRITION & HEALTH AND
APPLICANTS FOR EMPLOYMENT

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

DuPont Nutrition & Health can achieve its vision only through and with the full support, commitment, participation and cooperative spirit of its increasingly diverse work force. It is essential to obtain that commitment and spirit by respecting each and every individual, valuing their uniqueness and treating them fairly.

It is the policy of DuPont Nutrition & Health not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of age (within statutory limits), race, religion, color, sex, disability, national origin, ancestry, marital status, sexual orientation or veteran status with respect to hiring, promotion, demotion, transfer, recruitment, termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation and selection for training.

DuPont Nutrition & Health is committed to a program of affirmative action to assure that minorities, women and other protected classes are encouraged to seek employment with the Company and to strive for advancement. Responsibility for auditing and periodically reporting progress to management is assigned to Jane McManus, Human Resources Manager.

I endorse our EEO policy and our program to carry it out, and look forward to receiving your continued cooperation and assistance in our affirmative action efforts. The Affirmative Action Plan may be reviewed by contacting Jane McManus, Human Resources Manager, on 695-5253 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

J. Erik Fyrwald
Vice President & General Manager

November 1, 2002
November 04, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

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

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

Subject: Rationale for Same Day Briefing and Court Order


It is necessary to proceed with the solicitation of bids for the replacement of the hydraulic jack for Elevator #1 – Kennedy Garage to award a contract and complete the work and return the elevator to service as soon as possible.
November 04, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

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

Through: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations


BACKGROUND: The elevator #1 at Kennedy Parking Garage has shown signs of hydraulic fluids leaking into the underground. This was first brought to our attention when a static load test was performed, as oil was lost in the tank. It was detected on October 20, 2003 that the unit moved down 2 inches over a 24-hour period. There was a similar problem with the elevator #2 at Kennedy Garage, some 18 months ago and we corrected the problem on an emergency basis at that time.

The County elevator consultants, CMH & Associates, have been requested to quickly prepare the specifications for the Hydraulic Jack Replacement for competitive bidding and construction.

IMPACT/OPERATIONS: This work will replace the 1968 elevator ‘Single Jack’ with a new cylinder and new plunger to meet new hydraulic elevator codes.

LEGAL: N/A

M/WBE INFORMATION: N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Funds remain available in prior year major elevator improvements (Fund 120.1021.08132.2002) for this work.

RECOMMENDATION: Engineering & Project Management recommends that the Commissioners Court allow the Purchasing Department to solicit for competitive bids for this elevator repair work. A Court Order authorizing advertisement has been prepared and placed on the formal agenda.

Approved:

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations
October 29, 2003

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Commissioners Court

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

SUBJECT: Rationale for Same Date Briefing and Court Order

The Public Works Department in effort to avoid delays in the award of appraisal services contracts for the remaining CMAQ Project has been placed on today’s Formal Agenda, authorization to proceed with evaluation of the submitted Statement of Qualifications for the selection of Independent Appraisal Services.

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

SC: cd
Forms/ ltr rationale example
MEMORANDUM:

TO: Commissioners Court

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

SUBJECT: Request for Statements of Qualifications
For Independent Appraisal Services
SOQ No. 2004-008-1424

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to the Request for Qualifications for Independent Appraisal Services, the Purchasing Department received Statement of Qualifications on October 27, 2003 from six responding appraisers and/or appraisal firms as follows:

1. John G. Hirschy & Associates of Dallas
2. Integra Realty Resources
3. ROWAC, Inc. (Right of Way Acquisition Consultants)
4. Evaluation Associates
5. Pyles Whatley Corporation

LEGAL INFORMATION

This matter has been discussed with the Purchasing Department and the Assistant District Attorney's Office – Civil Section and after an initial review of the Statement of Qualifications the consensus was that the Statement of Qualifications submitted by ROWAC, Inc. (Right of Way Acquisition Consultants) was non-responsive in that it failed to comply with the requirement that the appraiser be on the "Approved Independent Appraiser List". This prequalification requirement is in accordance with the established Dallas County Policy that governs procurement of appraisal services. Additionally, Addendum No. 1, Item 3, stated as follows:

Refer to I. INTRODUCTION, D. Stipulations:
Submittal of Qualifications for this request will be accepted from appraiser or appraisal firms which are on the Dallas County "Approved Independent Appraiser List".
IMPACT ON OPERATIONS

N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT

N/A

PERFORMANCE MEASURES IMPACT

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

The Director of Public Works recommends as follows: (1) that the Commissioners Court accept the five responsive Statement of Qualifications submitted by John G. Hirschy & Associates of Dallas, Integra Realty Resources, Evaluation Associates, Pyles Whatley Corporation, Steven J. Kunkel & Associates, Inc. and authorize the Appraiser Selection Committee evaluate and select qualified appraisers and/or appraiser firm for the projects listed in the Request for Qualifications, and (2) reject the non-responsive Statement of Qualifications submitted by ROWAC, Inc. (Right of Way Acquisition Consultants).

If the Commissioners Court concur a Court Order has been placed on today's formal agenda to avoid delays in awarding appraisal service contracts on the remaining CMAQ Projects.

APPROVED BY:

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

Cd: SC
Selas 2003-03/brief eval appr soq

xc: Linda Boles, Purchasing Agent
Bowen Weems, Assistant District Attorney – Civil Section
Date: November 4, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

Through: John Hennessey, M.I.S. Director

From: Rodney Christian

Subject: Improved Internet Connectivity for Dallas County

BACKGROUND

Since 1998, primary internet hosting and connectivity for Dallas County Offices has been provided by XO Communications over a single T-1 Network connection (1.5 MB/second speed). More and more, County employees require access to the internet to perform their jobs. More County applications rely on the internet to distribute and gather data. More external agencies are using the internet to access County information and more citizens are using the internet to conduct business with the County. Our internet utilization has outstripped our capacity, resulting in slow internet access and response times.

It can only be expected that the demands on internet usage will continue to grow. With more and more applications being developed for web usage (Courts Packages) and citizens desiring efficient methods for interacting with the County (County website), sharing information with other governmental agencies (JIS/AIS) the need for additional internet bandwidth has become apparent.

The District Attorney's Office currently has its own internet hosting provider and a T-1 connection. This service should be considered for an upgrade as well to double its existing capacity (to 3 MB). The Juvenile Information System (JIS) has also experienced very significant internet increased usage and growth over the past 3 years and is also in need of upgrading its T-1 internet connection. As costs of internet service have fallen, it should be expected that the increased bandwidth for the District Attorney's Office and JIS should be available at no appreciable additional cost over what the County is currently paying.

OPERATIONAL IMPACT

Monitoring reports from the County's web portal indicates that the T-1 connection to the current web host is fully saturated. Starting at 8:00am and continuing through 5:00pm, the connection is filled to capacity. This slows the response County employees receive when performing business functions on the internet, impacts the processing of e-mail, and impacts citizens as they do business on the County's website. Without increased internet bandwidth, response times and productivity will continue to suffer. Similar response time issues have been identified at both the
Frank Crowley Criminal Courts facility and the Henry Wade Juvenile Justice center.

Also, a need exists for proactive monitoring of the internet portal. As more and more business functions move to the internet, it will be imperative that problems and downtime be minimal or non-existent. It is expected that the new internet service will include the monitoring and support tools necessary to avoid problems and quickly resolve issues that do happen to occur.

**Proposed solution:** Procure a 20 MB (minimum) internet connection and web host for the County's primary web connection, a 3 MB internet connection and web host for the District Attorney's web connection, and a 3 MB internet connection for the JIS system.

### FISCAL IMPACT
Currently, the County pays $6,000 / month for these three services. The estimated additional $1,000 / month would increase the County's primary internet portal to 13 times its current capacity and double the capacity of the JIS and District Attorney's internet portals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Proposed Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County's Primary Web Hosting / Portal</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIS</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney's Web Hosting / Portal</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATION
This M.I.S. Director recommends that the Commissioners Court approve the publishing of a Request for Proposal for a Primary Internet Host with a minimum of a 20 MB connection, a District Attorney Internet Host with a minimum of a 3 MB connection and a JIS internet connection with a minimum of a 3 MB connection.

The IT staff will use the standard County Purchasing RFP boilerplate and include the Technical Requirements contained in this document.

Approved by:

John Hennessey, M.I.S. Director
1. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

1.1 Contractor/Vendor shall furnish all on-site installation, labor, personnel, service, supervision, support, skills, software, hardware, hosting, equipment, material, supplies, transportation, shipping, handling, and documentation necessary to perform the service and work required for providing Dallas County with Internet Access ports.

1.2 Contractor/Vendor shall be responsible for delivering:

1.2.1 A minimum 20Mbps Internet Access port to the George Allen Courts Building 600 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75202.

1.2.2 A minimum 3Mbps Internet Access port to the Frank Crowley Courts Building 133 N. Industrial Blvd., Dallas, Texas 75207.

1.2.3 A minimum 3Mbps Internet Access port to the Henry Wade Juvenile Justice Center 2600 Lone Star Drive, Dallas, Texas 75212.

1.3 Contractor/Vendor shall install, stage, and configure all required circuit(s), router(s) [including 24 hour burn-in], and all other hardware and software items required to provide Internet access on-site.

1.4 Any routers installed for this project upgrade shall be Cisco 2600 series or greater and should have a minimum of 64Mb of DRAM and additional WIC Cards-NRC. Any switches installed for this project shall be Cisco WS-C3550-24-SMI or greater, and shall include at least one Cisco WS-G5484 GBIC.

1.5 Internet Access Upgrade shall also include but not limited to the following:

1.5.1 Internet Access at 20Mbps (minimum) at the Records Building site.

1.5.2 Internet Access at 3Mbps (minimum) at the Frank Crowley site.

1.5.3 Internet Access at 3Mbps (minimum) at the Henry Wade site.

1.5.4 Network monitoring and customer service

1.5.5 Domain Name Service hosting and domain migration

1.5.6 Back-up e-mail spooling service

1.5.7 IP Address assignment – full Class C block of addresses (254)

1.5.8 Project Coordination

1.6 On-Site Maintenance and Support Service shall include but not be limited to the following:

1.6.1 24x7 Support, Maintenance and Monitoring of all circuits and networks

1.6.2 Operation Center monitoring/tracking tools to maintain records of circuit issues

1.6.3 Notification of client (Dallas County) if service is affected by an unplanned outage
1.6.4 Software maintenance, advanced replacement, CCO access and Technical Assistance (TAC)'s

1.6.5 Cisco Networks SMARTnet On-Site Premium 24x7x4 Maintenance and Support

SMARTnet On-Site Premium 24x7x4 Maintenance and Support shall include but not be limited to:

1.6.5.1 Replacement of failed hardware on-site at Dallas County facility within four (4) hours by a Cisco Trained Systems Engineer upon notification by Dallas County or diagnoses by CISCO of hardware failure (whichever applies first).

1.6.5.2 Access (24x7) to Cisco's Technical Assistance Center, to assist with product use, configuration and troubleshooting.

1.6.5.3 Software updates provided (at no additional charge) for the duration of the contract.

1.6.5.4 User documentation in the form of paper copy, along with CD's equal to the number of chassis under support

1.6.5.5 All services and support mentioned above shall be available twenty-four (24) hours a day, three hundred, sixty-five (365) days a year.

1.7 Tier I or Tier II Engineering Support shall include but not be limited to:

1.7.1 Immediate attention from a Senior Engineer

1.7.2 Engineer shall work the problem until a handoff is required. Any handoff will be documented in the problem log

1.7.3 Documented procedures and timeframes for escalating problem. A copy of those procedures shall be provide to Dallas County – IT Services Department upon award.

1.8 During the term of this agreement Contractor/Vendor agrees to meet or exceed the minimum Service Level Requirements stated below:

1.8.1 Packet Loss: Less than 0.3%

1.8.2 Latency: 50ms or less

1.8.3 Availability: 99.95% or better
October 29, 2003

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

Dallas County has served as the local sponsor for the Metroplex Sub-Regional Solid Waste Study, which was funded through the North Central Texas Council of Governments. The work on the grant study has been completed. To expedite the closeout of the grant, I ask that the Commissioners Court consider the briefing and court order on November 4, 2003.
November 4, 2003

To: Commissioners Court
From: Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator
Subject: Acceptance of Metroplex Sub-Regional Solid Waste Study

BACKGROUND
In December of 2002, Dallas County received a grant from the North Central Texas Council of Governments for $100,000 to conduct the "Metroplex Sub-Regional Solid Waste Study". This study covered the five counties of Dallas, Ellis, Johnson, Kaufman and Tarrant. In February of 2003 the consulting firm of Reed, Stowe, and Yanke was engaged to perform this study. An oversite committee made of representatives from the five counties, plus various cities in the region directed the consultants work. The study has been completed. A copy of the executive summary is attached.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS
This study quantifies solid waste disposal needs in the five county region, identifies shortfalls in landfill capacity and suggest several strategies to address those needs through either regional cooperative solutions, the use of advance landfill technology or both.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There is no direct impact on Dallas County. Indirectly the future cost of disposal services will be affected by the available landfill capacity, travel distances, and quantities of waste to be disposed.

LEGAL
As a requirement of the grant, the Dallas County Commissioners Court must formally receive the final study.
RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that the Dallas County Commissioners Court formally accept the "Metroplex Sub-Regional Solid Waste Study" prepared by Reed, Stowe, and Yanke. If the Commissioners Court concurs, a court order will be prepared for the next Commissioners Court meeting.

Recommend by:

Dan Savage, Assistant Administrator for Operations

Attachment
Executive Summary

Project Background
In the SEE Less Trash Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, the regional solid waste management plan for the North Central Texas region, the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) recognized that the region’s generation of waste has been increasing steadily while population continues to grow. Consequently, large amounts of waste will continue to be generated and will need to be managed in an adequate and proper manner. The long-term success of solid waste management in the NCTCOG region is dependent upon identifying and implementing effective and environmentally prudent ways of handling municipal solid waste. Therefore, there is a need to evaluate optimal integrated waste management practices that can be implemented at a sub-regional level.

Over 12 years ago, the Metroplex Solid Waste Study Group (Group) formed as a sub-regional committee to the NCTCOG’s Resource Conservation Council (RCC). The Group has sustained participation throughout this period from cities and counties in Dallas, Ellis, Johnson, Kaufman, and Tarrant counties. These five counties have coordinated efforts in past years as landfill space has dwindled and several landfills have closed.

Recognizing that population in North Central Texas is expected to continue to grow over the next few decades and that these changes could present significant solid waste disposal challenges to local communities and county governments, Dallas County, on behalf of the Group, decided to sponsor a study to evaluate the long-term availability of disposal capacity for the five counties comprising the Group. In 2002 Dallas County applied for and received a grant from the NCTCOG to fund a Metroplex Sub-Regional Solid Waste Study (Metroplex Study). In January 2003, Dallas County selected RS&Y as the prime contractor to conduct this study. The RS&Y project team was composed of staff from RS&Y, a division of R.W. Beck, Chiang, Patel & Yerby, Inc., and Lloyd, Gosselink, Blevins, Rochelle, Baldwin & Townsend, P.C.

Project Purpose
The purpose of the Metroplex Study is to develop an effective planning and resource guide to assist Group member communities in addressing their disposal issues through 2030. Listed below are the primary objectives of the Metroplex Study:

- Provide a 30-year population projection for the sub-region.
- Determine current waste flows and project future quantities.
- Report on current waste diversion projects and identify enhancements that will optimize the combined resources of the Group.
- Identify the current disposal capacity in the region, project capacity for planned facilities, and recommend sub-regional facilities to be developed.
• Identify general siting requirements, funding, and organization to develop sub-regional facilities.
• Research the benefits, procedures and interest in developing a sub-regional authority(s) to manage future facilities.
• Identify objectives and strategies that compliment the goals found in the *SEE Less Trash Regional Solid Waste Management Plan*.
• Summarize and compile findings into a final report and present to the RCC.

**Key Findings**

The RS&Y project team conducted extensive analyses to develop estimates of future disposal amounts and waste flows across the study area. The key findings from this analysis follow.

> **The regional availability of disposal is projected to be limited to a handful of landfills in 2030**

Only seven of the 16 landfills currently accepting waste from cities and unincorporated areas in the Metroplex Study area would have remaining capacity available in 2030. These would include:

- ECD
- CSC Avalon
- City of Grand Prairie
- Irving Hunter-Ferrell
- Dallas McCommas Bluff
- NTMWD 121 RDF
- Garland-Hinton

> **Cities located on the western side of the Metroplex will need to address capacity issues as early as 2020**

For cities located on the western side of the Metroplex, the availability of disposal capacity becomes an issue as early as 2020 with the closure of the Turkey Creek and Fort Worth SE Landfills. At a minimum, additional transfer stations would be needed at this time.

> **Increased diversion analysis is limited due to the availability of limited data, but diversion is projected to have a measurable impact**

The increased diversion analysis is based on the following assumptions:

• A 50 percent increase in the quantity of materials diverted from disposal for single-family residences (i.e., increase diversion rate from 10 to 15.6 percent)
• The amount of multi-family and commercial waste disposed annually is 10 percent less than the amount currently disposed
• Increases in diversion occur gradually over a 5 year period beginning in 2004

Based on the increased diversion assumptions identified, an additional 18 months of landfill capacity would be available to dispose of waste generated in the region. In addition to saving landfill space, increasing the amount of waste diverted from disposal would reduce expenditures on landfill tipping fees. Based on the current average tipping fee of $24.00 per ton\(^1\), in today’s dollars, local governments could achieve gross cost savings of $362,113,584. The RS&Y project team would like to note that this amount is a gross figure and does not include costs that would be associated with the increases in diversion levels.

In terms of the impact on specific landfills, of the nine landfills expected to close during the period 2002 through 2030, four will remain open for an additional year, and one will remain open for an additional two years if the amount of waste diverted from landfill disposal increases:

- Fort Worth SE (1 additional year)
- WM DFW (1 additional year)
- WM Skyline (1 additional year)
- Turkey Creek (1 additional year)
- City of Arlington (2 additional years)

For the landfills expected to remain open in 2030, the projected number of years of landfill capacity remaining in 2030 increases anywhere from 2 to 5 years under the increased diversion scenario:

- CSC Avalon (2 additional years)
- ECD (2 additional years)
- Garland-Hinton (2 additional years)
- City of Grand Prairie (3 additional years)
- Irving Hunter-Ferrell (5 additional years)
- Dallas McCommas Bluff (2 additional years)
- NTMWD 121 RDF (2 additional years)

► Development of bioreactor landfills could potentially have a positive impact on the long-term availability of regional capacity

Besides reducing the volume of waste entering the landfill, another method for increasing the lifespan of a disposal facility is to reduce the amount of landfill air space required per ton of waste disposed. Currently, operation of a bioreactor landfill is an evolving method

\(^1\) The $24.00 per ton average is based on both restricted and open market rates.
by which to increase the efficiency of a landfill. Three cities within the study area have expressed an interest in investigating the feasibility of operating their landfills as bioreactor landfills:

- The City of Arlington
- The City of Grand Prairie
- The City of Dallas

Based on the bioreactor sensitivity analysis, the number of years of additional capacity at their individual sites that could be gained by operating the landfills owned by these cities as bioreactor landfills ranges from 8 to 14 years.

**Recommendations**

Based on the key findings of the analyses, the RS&Y project team developed several recommendations for the NCTCOG and local communities to consider when addressing long-term disposal capacity issues in the Metroplex. These recommendations are presented below.

▷ **Start planning and analysis to address disposal capacity issues soon**

Planning for and analyzing the viability of the various options available to address future disposal capacity issues will be a time consuming process. In addition, if local communities decide that a new landfill is the best option for ensuring the availability of long-term disposal capacity, the permitting process alone can take an average of 8 years. To ensure that capacity is constructed and readily available when existing landfills are close to reaching capacity, local communities must begin the planning and analysis process soon.

▷ **Examine opportunities for creation of a regional landfill**

Based on the projected reduction in the number of open landfills in 2030, a regional facility will be needed to ensure that communities within the Metroplex have ready access to disposal capacity. The term “regional facility” can mean different things to different people. For purposes of this study, the term “regional facility” is defined as follows:

Any facility that provides disposal services to more than one community within the Metroplex Study area. Within the context of this report and in terms of the regional planning process, a regional facility can be formulated in any of the following methods:

1. As a regional entity (serving the entire Metroplex)
2. Sub-regional facilities located in key parts of the Metroplex
3. Interlocal agreements or contracts
   - between governmental entities
   - between governmental entities and the private sector
4. Public/private partnerships
Based on the definition provided, there could be more than one sub-regional facility that accommodates the disposal needs for a number of cities and/or counties. For example, the western side of the Metroplex will be facing capacity issues several years earlier than the eastern side of the Metroplex. Therefore, a “sub-regional facility” may be appropriate for a subset of communities on the western side of the study area and another “sub-regional facility” may be a good solution for local communities on the eastern side of the Metroplex at a later date.

The establishment of a regional facility does not necessarily have to be a formal arrangement. Rather, a regional facility could be created by a group of communities entering into local agreements with a landfill that is already operating in the area. The Dallas Water Utility System and the City of Lubbock are two examples of regional operations that were established through an informal process.

The Dallas McCommas Bluff Landfill is expected to have a significant amount of capacity during the planning period and currently receives a significant amount of the waste volume that would be needed to support the up-front funding of the fixed costs associated with operating as a regional landfill. Therefore, the City of Dallas and other local communities may want to investigate opportunities for the Dallas McCommas Bluff Landfill to serve as a regional landfill.

As a first step to evaluating the possibility of establishing a regional facility, there will be a need to identify local governments that might be interested in participating in the creation of a regional landfill. To ensure that all participants can benefit from a regional facility, additional analyses should be conducted to determine the financial and technical feasibility of a regional landfill for all potential participants. Based on the results of the feasibility analyses, local communities should analyze the potential options for establishing multi-jurisdictional strategic arrangements.

> Establish a regional tracking system that can be implemented at the local level to better quantify diversion rates

The current availability of diversion data is very limited. Although the RS&Y project team requested diversion data from local communities as part of this study, few cities track activities in sufficient detail to obtain a comprehensive understanding of current diversion rates and the potential for increased diversion in the future. A better understanding of diversion activity is needed to determine how government efforts to encourage diversion impact the availability of capacity at both regional and sub-regional levels.

> Increase diversion rates by expanding the scope of cost-effective diversion programs

Based on the sensitivity analysis conducted for this report, cities in the Metroplex could potentially recognize modest cost savings by increasing diversion rates, both in terms of longer landfill life spans and reduced tipping fees. Some of these cost savings will be
reduced due to additional costs incurred to implement enhanced waste diversion programs. To ensure that these costs are minimized, local governments should expand the scope of diversion programs in as cost-effective a manner as possible. Examples of cost-effective diversion programs include improving existing programs, changing collection methods, examining options for strategic regional partnerships, and diverting brush that is already collected separately from garbage.

> Conduct a feasibility analysis to better define the technical requirements, costs, and benefits of bioreactor landfills

The waste flow analysis conducted for this study indicates that bioreactor landfills could potentially increase the lifespan of three landfills within the Metroplex Study area: 1) The City of Arlington Landfill; 2) The City of Grand Prairie Landfill; and 3) the Dallas McCommas Bluff Landfill. At this time information on the technical feasibility and cost of operating these three landfills as bioreactor landfills is not available. Therefore, the viability of using bioreactors to extend long-term landfill capacity is difficult to determine at this time. The RS&Y project team recommends that the cities interested in operating their landfills as bioreactor landfills conduct a technical and financial feasibility analysis to better define the technical requirements, costs, and benefits of operating their facilities as bioreactor landfills.

**Study Format**

The RS&Y project team developed this study through a progression of logical steps. Descriptions of the evaluations and analyses completed for this study are provided in the following sections of the report:

**Section 1:** Provides background information describing why an analysis of long-term disposal capacity is needed as well as the primary objectives of the study. Information on the data sources used to conduct the analysis described in the report is also provided in this section.

**Section 2:** The first step in conducting the analysis of future disposal capacity was to determine the study area population for the period 2002 through 2030. Information on future population trends is needed to determine how much waste will be disposed of in the future. Section 2 describes the methodology employed to develop annual population estimates for the 2003-2030 planning period and presents the results.

**Section 3:** Municipal solid waste is generated primarily from three sources: single family residences, multi-family residences, and commercial businesses. The purpose of Section 3 is to describe the process employed to develop waste disposal estimates for each of these sources of waste and present the results.
Section 4: In Section 4, information on the amount of disposal capacity expected to be available is presented as well as a summary of the regional and sub-regional disposal capacity analysis. A chronology of landfill closures for the baseline scenario is provided as well as a discussion of the potential impacts of increased diversion and the use of bioreactor landfills on the long-term availability of disposal capacity.

Section 5: This section presents the key findings of the analyses described in Sections 2 through 4 and presents some recommendations to begin addressing the capacity issues identified.

Section 6: The purpose of this section is to provide local communities with a better understanding of the analyses that would need to be conducted to determine the financial feasibility of a regional disposal facility and the options available for funding the construction and/or operation of a regional landfill.

Section 7: In Section 7, a discussion of the various options available to local communities for establishing strategic partnerships to address disposal capacity issues at a regional level is provided. Both informal and formal partnership arrangements are discussed as well as the advantages and disadvantages of each type of arrangement.

Section 8: Section 8 provides a discussion of the planning process and siting criteria for sanitary landfills. The purpose of this section is to provide an additional source of reference material for local communities to use when planning for future disposal capacity. An example timeline based on data from several landfill projects recently completed in the North Texas area is provided to illustrate the average amount of time for each step in the siting and approval process.

Appendix A: Provides annual estimates of single-family, multi-family, and commercial waste disposal quantities by city for each of the years in the planning period.

Appendix B: Provides annual estimates of the amount of waste projected to be disposed of at each of the 16 landfills included in the study for each year of the planning period.
October 28, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

Through: Ryan Brown, Budget Officer

From: Shawn Balusek, Budget and Policy Analyst

Subject: Key Telephone System Replacement

BACKGROUND:
During the FY04 budget process, the Communications and Central Services Department submitted a PIR to upgrade telephone systems located at remote County sites listed on Attachment A. The Office of Budget and Evaluation did not recommend the request, but advised Commissioners Court that should the County decide to utilize reprogrammed certificate of obligations or tax-note funds, this request could be funded from one of these funding sources.

The purpose of this briefing is to provide Commissioners Court a recommendation concerning the funding of key telephone system upgrades.

IMPACT/OPERATIONS:
The current telephone systems are 12 to 15 years old. The manufacturer has discontinued these systems and parts and telephones are not readily available. When parts and supplies can be located, they are more expensive than the corresponding components for newer systems.

The current systems do not and can not provide voice mail, analog ports or direct in-dial capabilities. The upgrade will improve communication efficiency at the selected County locations and provide increased customer service to internal and external customers.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The total cost to upgrade the 16 selected sites is $236,500. Funding is available from reprogrammed certificates of obligations (Fund 423, FY1998).

RECOMMENDATION:
The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that Commissioner’s Court approve the key telephone system replacements listed on Attachment A sheet for a cost of $236,500 and funded from reprogrammed certificate of obligations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY OFFICE</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>COUNTY OFFICE</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Machine Warehouse 1406 A East Langdon Road</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>Tax Office 100 East Wheatland Road Duncanville, TX</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Tx 75239</td>
<td></td>
<td>2436 Valley View Farmers Branch, TX 75234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road &amp; Bridge 3 1506 East Langdon Road</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Tax Office 525 West Highway 303 Grand Prairie, TX</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX 75216</td>
<td></td>
<td>75050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Service Center 738 Fort Worth Ave.</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Tax Office 210 West Grubbs Mesquite, TX 75149</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX 75208</td>
<td></td>
<td>75149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 2 1330 River Bend Dr.</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Tax Office 516 Twilight Trail Richardson, TX</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suite 820 Dallas, TX 75247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 4 3939 Hwy 80</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Tax Office 1137 South Jupiter Garland, TX 75042</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Mesquite 75150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 8 7220 Westmorland</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Adult Probation-Garland 1137 South Jupiter Garland, TX 75042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 225 Dallas, TX 75212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 3 7330 Gaston Road</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Cook Chill 2121 French Settlement Dallas, TX 75235</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX 75214</td>
<td></td>
<td>75235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 10 418 E. Airport Fwy</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, TX 75262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation District 5 10121 East Lake</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21 East Lake June Dallas, TX 75217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST $236,500
November 4, 2003

TO: Commissioners Court

THROUGH: Ryan Brown, Budget Officer

FROM: Scott Secrest, Budget and Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Conversion of CJD Grant Forensic Biologist to County Position

Background
In 1999, Dallas County accepted a CJD grant for a Forensic Biologist I in the Criminal Investigation Laboratory of the Institute of Forensic Sciences. Initially, the CJD grant provided 100% of the cost of the position. With each ensuing year, the grant funding decreased by 20% and the county agreed to absorb the costs not provided by the grant. FY2003 was the final year of the grant, with the county absorbing 80% of the cost of the position in exchange of the grant providing the remaining 20%.

The Institute of Forensic Sciences submitted a request to officially convert this position to full-time County funding. However, the request was omitted from the Baseline Budget books and therefore was not discussed during Budget Hearings. The purpose of this briefing is to make a recommendation regarding the conversion of this Forensic Biologist to a full-time county position.

Operational Impact
This Forensic Biologist position is responsible for performing independent DNA forensic testing of biological samples for the purpose of human identity determination. They are also responsible for independent case analysis and serving as expert testimony in trials. In FY2003, there were 10,810 Forensic Biology analyses submitted to IFS. This is a decrease compared to FY2002, but still represents a 30% increase when compared to FY2000. Specifically, IFS has begun to target the DNA casework, adding performance measures to try to reduce the backlog. At the end of FY2002, DNA casework backlog was at 239. At the end of FY2003, the number was reduced to 230, after completing a total of 228 cases. Without this position, the case backlog would cease decreasing and begin to build back up to an undesirable level. The position will remain responsible for all previous duties.

Financial Impact
The total cost of salary and benefits for this position is $54,985 for FY2004. This represents an increased cost to the county of approximately $7,557 compared to last year. In order to offset the cost of this position's transfer and some recent reclassifications, the Institute of Forensic Science has raised the cost of all DNA analysis fees by 5% and is holding a Drug Chemist position vacant for a minimum of five months. The fee increase is expected to bring an additional $45,000 to Dallas County. The vacant position will save $20,506 in salary and benefits over the course of the five
months it is anticipated to be held vacant. These combine for a total net saving to the County of $65,506, which absorbs the additional cost of the conversion of this position and the reclassifications.

**Recommendation**
The Office of Budget and Evaluation recommends that the Commissioners Court authorize the conversion of a grant funded Forensic Biologist to the County General Fund effective October 1, 2003.
November 4, 2003

To: Commissioners Court

From: J. Allen Clemson, Administrator

Subject: Dallas County’s 2003 Annual Audit Performed by KPMG, LLP

BACKGROUND OF ISSUES

KPMG, LLP was awarded Dallas County’s contract for performing the County’s statutorily required annual financial audit. This contract has been extended for the past two years consistent with the County’s original request for proposal and practice of utilizing an audit firm for five-years. KPMG completed the Audit Reports for fiscal years 2000, 2001 and 2002 in accordance with the terms and conditions of their contractual obligation with the County and generally accepted accounting standard.

The purpose of the briefing is to present a recommendation to the Commissioners Court to approve the attached Amendment and Extension No. 2 to the Agreement between Dallas County, Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections and KPMG, LLP for Financial Audit Services.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS

Dallas County is required to annually complete a financial audit, single audit, CSCD audit, TJPC audit and Charter School audit. Over the past three fiscal years this work has been performed by KPMG. For the fiscal year of 2003, KPMG has submitted proposed engagement letters to conduct the required annual audit services. KPMG’s fees include a 3% consumer price index increase from their prior year fee that is consistent with conditions approved in Commissioners Court Order 2000-1774, and a 12% increase in the base rate for the financial audit, single audit and TJPC audit related to the increased time and efforts required to comply with exceptional audit findings.

Due to the time constraints placed on completing the audit work, the proposed Amendment and Extension No. 2 contains a new provision that extends authority to the County Auditor to have KPMG perform additional work beyond the scope of work and fees in this agreement, if the County Auditor deems it necessary because of unanticipated audit findings. Any increase in the scope of work and fees beyond the 10% authority that is conveyed to the County Auditor must be approved by formal action of the Commissioners Court.
**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Dallas County’s annual audit fee for FY 2002 was $284,865 and the FY 2003 fee is $230,500. A summary of the financial issues is exhibited in the attached memorandum from Virginia Porter. In Mrs. Porter’s summary, the major changes in cost are for the County audit, which is up $13,500 and the Charter School audit, down $51,615.

**LEGAL**

The Dallas County District Attorney’s office has drafted and approved the attached Amendment and Extension No. 2 to the Agreement between Dallas County, Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department and KPMG, LLP.

**M/WBE**

Attached for the Commissioners Court’s information is an updated EEO1 from KPMG and a summary of their utilization of a minority women business owned enterprise contact.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Dallas County Auditor and Dallas County Commissioners Court Administrator recommend that the Commissioners Court approve the attached Amendment and Extension No. 2 to the Agreement between Dallas County, Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department and KPMG, LLP for Dallas County’s financial audit, single audit, CSCD audit and TJPC audit and Charter School audit for the fiscal year of 2003.

Recommended by

Allen Clemson, Administrator

Attachments

cc:  Ron Goethals, Director
     Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections
MINORITY/WOMEN
BUSINESS SPECIFICATIONS
FOR BIDS/RFPs

I. POLICY STATEMENT Dallas County is wholly committed to developing, establishing, maintaining, and enhancing minority involvement in the total procurement process. It is the policy of Dallas County to involve qualified minority/women-owned businesses to the greatest extent feasible in the County's procurement of goods, equipment, services, and construction projects. The County, its contractors, their suppliers and subcontractors, and vendors of goods, equipment services, and professional services shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, or sex in the award and/or performance of contracts. However, competition and quality of work remain the ultimate "yardstick" in contractor, subcontractor, vendor, service, professional service, and supplier utilization. All vendors, suppliers, professionals, and contractors doing business or anticipating doing business with Dallas County shall support, encourage, and implement affirmative steps toward our common goal of establishing equal opportunity for all citizens of Dallas County.

II. REQUIREMENT OF ALL BIDDERS Each firm responding to this solicitation shall be required to submit with their bid information regarding minority/women business participation in this project. This would include:

Check upon completion (forms attached):

[X] 1. Compliance with Dallas County's Good Faith Effort Policy.

[X] 2. MBE/WBE Participation Report Form.

[X] 3. A Letter of Assurance A or a Letter of Assurance B.

[X] 4. MBE/WBE Identification.

[X] 5. Vendor Statistical Report (must also be submitted on subcontractors with 20% or more of the work).


Note

In the event that the awarded vendor is authorized to subcontract and commits effort to utilize minority and/or women owned businesses as subcontractors, the name, address and telephone number of the actual subcontractor(s) with actual dollar awards to these subcontractors must be submitted to the Purchasing Department within five (5) working days after bids are opened. Once work commences, the awarded vendor (prime contractor) must submit an M/WBE subcontractor status payment report (attached) with each payment invoice before payments will be authorized for release.

filename: c:\mbe\mbe_899.wpd
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1. GOOD FAITH EFFORT

Prior to an award, all bidders/proposers will be required to document a "Good Faith Effort" to secure minority/women-owned businesses as subcontractors/subconsultants. In the case of some construction projects, this documentation may be submitted after award of the contract, for those subcontract areas occurring later in the construction process. However, if the successful bidder does not document a "Good Faith Effort" in securing minority/women-owned businesses, a representative of the company must appear before the Dallas County Commissioners Court and explain the situation and answer any questions raised by the Court.

Fulfillment of the "good faith effort" can be accomplished by:

1. Attendance of pre-bid/pre-proposal conference, as scheduled by the County.

2. Efforts to follow-up initial solicitation of interest by contacting minority/women-owned firms to determine with certainty whether these firms are interested.

3. Efforts made to select portions of the work proposed to be performed by minority/women-owned firms in order to increase the likelihood of achieving participation (including, where appropriate, breakdown of subcontracts into economically feasible units to facilitate participation).

4. Documenting each minority/woman-owned firm contacted, the conclusion or decision regarding inclusion and reasons for the conclusions.

5. Efforts to assist the minority/women-owned firms contacted that needed assistance in obtaining bonding, lines of credit or insurance.

6. Efforts that demonstrate that the contractor effectively used the services of available community organizations, contractor's groups, local, state and federal small businesses, minority/women business assistance offices and other organizations that provide assistance and placement of minority/woman-owned businesses.

Signed: __________________________

Printed Name: William P. Hanley

Title: Partner

Date: October 27, 2003
2. MBE/WBE PARTICIPATION REPORT

List each MBE/WBE business that you plan to use on this initiative. **Deletion of firms must be approved by Dallas County prior to finalization.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of MBE/WBE</th>
<th>NCTRCA Certification #</th>
<th>Phone#</th>
<th>S / M**</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma S. Walker</td>
<td>BFDB18384Y0304</td>
<td>817-332-3049</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>External Audit Services</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*North Central Texas Regional Certification Agency - **S = Sub (contractor/consultant) **M= Material Supplier

[ ] No MBE/WBE's Added

Please Explain

---

**COMPLETE THIS PORTION OF THE FORM WITH DATA ON YOUR COMPANY.**

NAME OF YOUR BUSINESS:  
KPMG LLP

ADDRESS:  
717 North Harwood Street, Suite 3100, Dallas, TX 75201

PHONE#:  
(214)840-2000

William P. Hanley
Printed Name Of Preparer

Partner
Title

Date  
10/27/03
**Minority/Women Business Specification**

### LETTERS OF ASSURANCE

**Letter Of Assurance "A"**

The undersigned bidder/proposer hereby assures that our firm will meet or exceed submitted M/WBE goals and shall demonstrate and document a Good Faith Effort to comply with the Dallas County Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprises in subcontract/subconsultant awards. The undersigned further agrees that any deviation from the initial goals will be done only with the concurrence of Dallas County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title (Officer of firm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG LLP</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>10/27/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Complete this section only if you're planning to use the services of a certified vendor)

**Letter Of Assurance "B"**

The undersigned bidder/proposer hereby certifies that our firm will perform the contract:

- [ ] with our own work forces, and submit information sufficient to demonstrated that it is our normal business practice to do so. or
- [ ] without the services of M/WBE subcontractors/subconsultants. The undersigned further submits GFE documented attempt(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title (Officer of firm)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Company Name]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Title (Officer of firm)]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Complete this section only if you're not planning to use the services of a certified vendor)

**NOTE:** Each proposer will be required to sign one of the above letters of assurance which should be returned with proposal.

---

### PRIME CONTRACTOR MBE/WBE IDENTIFICATION

**Minority Business Enterprise (MBE)** - The bidder/proposer represents that it:

- [ ] is,  [X] is not a minority-owned business, **NCTRCA #**

**Women Business Enterprise (WBE)** - The bidder/proposer represents that it:

- [ ] is,  [X] is not a women-owned business, **NCTRCA #**

*NCTRCA = North Central Texas Regional Certification (must be certified, by)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIF.</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</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 PACIF.</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check One: Minority-Owned Firm Certification # Issued by NCTRCA Signed by Name and Title: Bill Hanley, Partner

Signature/Date: [Signature]

Typed Name and Title: Bill Hanley, Partner
## DALLAS COUNTY
Vendor Statistical Report

### Permanent Full-Time Employment
(Not part time/temp/or seasonal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER.</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIF.</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE WORKERS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SERVICE WORKERS     |        |       |          |              |              |              |       |

| TOTAL               |        |       |          |              |              |              |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMER.</th>
<th>ASIAN PACIF.</th>
<th>ASIAN INDIAN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Managers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives (Semi Skilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check One: Minority-Owned Firm Certification #

Issued by: NCTRCA

Signature/Date: [Signature]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women-Owned Firm Certification #BFD18384Y0304</th>
<th>Issued by NCSCA</th>
<th>Typed Name and Title: Bill Hanley, Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority Owned Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DESCRIPTION OF JOB CATEGORIES**

**Officials and Managers** - Occupations requiring administrative/managerial personnel who set broad policies, exercise overall responsibility or execution of these policies, and direct individual departments or special phases of a firm's operations. *Includes*: officials, executives, middle managers, and superintendents, salaried supervisors who are members of management, purchasing agents and buyers, railroad conductors and yard masters, ship captains, mates and other officers, farm operators and managers, and kindred workers.

**Professionals** - Occupations requiring either college graduation or experience of such kind and amount as to provide a comparable background. *Includes*: accountants/auditors, airplane pilots, architects, artists, chemists, designers, dieticians, editors, engineers, lawyers, librarians, mathematicians, natural scientists, registered professional nurses, personnel/labor relations specialists, physical scientists, physicians, social scientists, teachers, and kindred workers.

**Technicians** - Occupations requiring a combination of basic scientific knowledge and manual skill which can be obtained through two (2) years of post-high school education, such as is offered in many technical institutes and junior colleges, or through equivalent on-the-job training. *Includes*: computer programmers, drafters, engineering aides, junior engineers, mathematical aides, licensed, practical or vocational nurses, photographers, radio operators, scientific assistants, surveyors, technical illustrators, technicians (medical, dental, electronic, physical science), and kindred workers.

**Sales** - Occupations engaging wholly or primarily in direct selling. *Includes*: advertising agents and sales workers, insurance agents and brokers, real estate agents and brokers, stock and bond sales workers, demonstrators, sales workers and sales clerks, grocery clerks, and cashiers/checkers, and kindred workers.

**Office and Clerical** - Includes clerical type work regardless of level of difficulty, where the activities are predominately non-manual though some manual work not directly involved with altering or transporting the products is included. *Includes*: bookkeepers, collectors (bills/accounts), messengers, office helpers, office machine operators (incl computer), shipping-receiving clerks, stenographers, typists, secretaries, telegraph/telephone operators, legal assistants, and kindred workers.

**Craft Workers (skilled)** - Manual workers of relatively high skill level having a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the processes involved in their work. Exercise considerable independent judgment and usually receive an extensive period of training. *Includes*: building rades, hourly paid supervisors and lead operators who are not members of management, mechanics and repairers, skilled machining occupations, compositors and typesetters, electricians, engravers, painters (construction and maintenance), motion picture projectionists, pattern/model makers, stationary engineers, tailors, traitoresses, art occupations, hand painters, coaters, bakers, decorating occupations, and kindred workers.

**Operatives (semiskilled)** - Workers who operate machine or processing equipment or perform other factory-type duties of intermediate skill level which can be mastered in a few weeks and require only limited training. *Includes*: apprentices (auto mechanics, plumbers bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, machinists, mechanics, building trades, metalworking trades, printing trades, etc.), operatives, attendants (auto service and parking), blasters, chauffeurs, delivery workers, sewers and stitches, dryers, furnace workers, heaters, laundry and dry cleaning operatives, milliners, mine operatives and laborers, motor operators, oils and greasers (except auto), painters (manufactured articles), photographic process workers, stationary fire fighters, truck and tractor drivers, knitting, looping, taping and weaving machine operators, welders and flame cutters, electrical and electronic equipment assemblers, butchers, meat cutters, inspectors, testers and graders, hand packers and packages, and kindred workers.

**Laborers (unskilled)** - Workers in manual occupations which generally require no special training, performs elementary duties that may be earned in a few days and requires the application of little or no independent judgement. *Includes*: garage laborers, car washers and greasers, groundskeeper and gardeners, farm workers, stevedores, wood choppers, laborers performing lifting, digging, mixing, loading and pulling operations, and kindred workers.

**Service Workers** - Workers in both protective and non-protective service occupations. *Includes*: attendants (hospital and other institutions, professional and personal service, including nurses aides, and orderlies), barbers, char-workers and cleaners, cooks, counter and fountain workers, elevator operators, fire fighters and fire protection, guards, doorknobs, stewards, janitors, police officers and detective, porters, waiters and waitresses, amusement and recreation facilities attendants, guides, users, public transportation attendants, and kindred workers.

**On-the-Job Trainees:**

**Production** - Persons engaged in formal training for craft worker -- when no trained under apprentice programs -- operative, laborer and service occupations.

**White Collar** - Persons engaged in formal training, for official, managerial, professional, technical, sales, office and clerical occupations.
### DALLAS COUNTY MBE/WBE PAYMENT REPORT

List each MBE/WBE business that you plan to use on this initiative. **Deletion of firms must be approved by Dallas County prior to finalization.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of MBE/WBE</th>
<th>Planned Amount</th>
<th>Planned %</th>
<th>Amount of Invoice</th>
<th>Amt Paid to Date</th>
<th>% to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma S. Walker, PC</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

*This form must be completed and submitted with each payment request.*

*Any (significant) deviation from planned should include attached explanation.*

The information listed above is certified to be correct:

Reviewed by:

Printed Name of Officer/Director  Signature of Officer/Director  Date  Dallas County Project Mgr  Date
September 15, 2003

TO: Allen Clemson, Court Administrator

FROM: Virginia Porter, County Auditor

SUBJECT: KPMG – Contract Extension

KPMG, LLP was awarded the contract for performance of required annual financial audits of Dallas County under bid 2000-166-518. The contract has been extended the past two years consistent with the County’s practice to utilize an audit firm for five-year intervals on an annual contract basis. Audit reports for fiscal years 2000-2002 were issued according to the terms of the contract and extension agreements.

Engagement letters from KPMG for FY03 County financial audit, single audit, CSCD, TJPC and Charter School audits are attached. Price increases are proposed for each audit. The engagement letters, consistent with conditions approved in Court Order 2000-1774, include a 3% CPI increase from prior year fees.

Additionally, the engagement letters indicate a proposed 12% increase for the financial audit, single audit, and TJPC audit related to the increased time and efforts required to comply with Statements of Auditing Standards # 99 (Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit) and # 96 (Audit Documentation) and additional TJPC audit requirements.

Proposed FY2003 fees and actual FY2002 fees are indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Audit</td>
<td>$101,500</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Audit</td>
<td>$ 61,000</td>
<td>$79,250 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other audits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSCD</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJPC</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$87,615 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$230,500</td>
<td>$284,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blended Rate for Additional Work $170 $165

(1) Initial contract price was $53,000; actual fees increased by $26,250. Additional fees approved by Commissioners Court were due to expanded scope in testing grant programs.

(2) Initial contract price was $35,000; actual fees increased by $52,615 largely due to federal regulatory requirements for “Special Procedures and Reports” related to Dropouts and Compensatory Education. Those reports and procedures will not be required for FY2003.

We have summarized audit engagement changes requested by KPMG and are requesting that you work with legal to develop an extension agreement and gain Commissioners Court approval since this is a Commissioners Court contract for independent audit services as prescribed in LGC 118.045. As was the
case last year, we understand that the Civil Section of DA office will recommend changes to the contract
Section III - Scope of Work relative to dates and Section V - Fees.

Attachments

VP: ag
AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION NO. 2

TO THE AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

DALLAS COUNTY ("COUNTY")

DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT ("CSCD")

AND

KPMG, LLP, CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS ("KPMG")

FOR FINANCIAL AUDIT SERVICES

WHEREAS, pursuant to Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2000-1774 dated September 5, 2000, Dallas County (hereinafter, "County") and Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (hereinafter, "CSCD"), acting by and through the Dallas County Commissioners Court, and KPMG, LLP, Certified Public Accountants (hereinafter, "KPMG") entered into a contract for financial audit services (hereinafter, "Original Contract"); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section II of the Original Contract, the parties have mutually agreed to extend the Original Contract from September 1, 2003 to August 31, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the parties have agreed as to the audit services to be performed and fees to be paid;

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises, inducements, covenants, agreements, conditions and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, by execution of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, the Original Contract is hereby amended as follows:

I. PURPOSE

This Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 amends and extends the Original Contract between County, CSCD and KPMG, as authorized by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2000-1774 dated September 5, 2000. This Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 amends the Original Contract to: (1) extend the term of the Original Contract for a period of one year, commencing on September 1, 2003 and ending on August 31, 2004; (2) require KPMG to maintain
minimum insurance coverage as required by the Original Contract and any subsequent amendments thereto to cover the term of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, as evidenced by insurance certificates to be furnished to County; (3) incorporate the fees to be charged to County by KPMG for the financial audit services during the term of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2; (4) incorporate the three (3) engagement letters between KPMG and County, KPMG and the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Charter School (hereinafter, “Charter School”), and KPMG and CSCD (collectively referred to as the “Engagement Letters”); and (5) establish an order of precedence between the Original Contract and any subsequent amendments thereto.

II. EXTENSION OF CONTRACT

By execution hereof, the Original Contract, as approved by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2000-1774 dated September 5, 2000, as amended by Contract Amendment and Extension No. 1, as authorized by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-1896 dated October 15, 2002, is hereby extended for an additional period of one year, commencing on September 1, 2003 and ending on August 31, 2004.

III. AMENDED PROVISIONS

This Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 shall not change or waive any contractual provisions, clauses or conditions of the Original Contract, as amended, each of which are incorporated herein by reference as if fully reproduced, word for word, and number for number. All provisions of the Original Contract, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect throughout the term of the Original Contract and any duly authorized amendments or extensions, including this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2. The Original Contract, as amended, is hereby amended by the following provisions:

Section III. Scope of Work of the Original Contract, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

The date “September 30, 2000” in the first sentence of Section III, Paragraph A, Subsection 1 of the Original Contract, as amended, is deleted and the date “September 30, 2003” is substituted therefor.

The date “August 31, 2000” in the first sentence of Section III, Paragraph A, Subsection 7 of the Original Contract, as amended, is deleted and the date “August 31, 2003” is substituted therefor.

Section V. Fees of the Original Contract, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section V. Fees of the Original Contract, as amended, is deleted and the following is substituted:

"V. Fees"

1. The County and CSCD agree to pay the Independent Certified Public Accountants for all audit services actually rendered as follows:

(A) Financial Audit, Federal and State Single Audit, CSCD and Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (hereinafter, “TJPC”) at the stated rate in the proposed/estimated audit amount as shown below.
(B) Charter School at the blended hourly rate of One Hundred Seventy and 00/100 Dollars ($170.00) and approved expenses incurred, such as traveling costs outside the County of Dallas, if any, printing and postage for confirmation of accounts balances, and other out-of-pocket items in the estimated audit amount as hereinafter shown for each item.

The total amount payable under this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 is hereby estimated to be at a sum of Two Hundred Eleven Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($211,000.00) for County and Nineteen Thousand Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars for CSCD, for a total estimated amount of Two Hundred Thirty Thousand Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars ($230,500.00). In the event that irregularities or other conditions necessitate additions to the scope of work and audit, the scope of work may be expanded by written agreement of the Dallas County Auditor on behalf of County, the Director of CSCD on behalf of CSCD, and KPMG. Any and all additional work beyond the scope of work and fees herein shall be at a blended hourly rate of $170.00 per hour not to exceed ten percent (10%) of the total estimated amount of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 without prior written approval of the Dallas County Commissioners Court, and shall not be commenced without prior written approval of the Dallas County Auditor on behalf of County and/or the Director of CSCD on behalf of CSCD.

Estimated Audit Amounts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Audit</td>
<td>$101,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State Single Audit</td>
<td>$ 61,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Juvenile Probation Commission</td>
<td>$ 12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>$ 36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCD (Criminal Justice Department funds)</td>
<td>$ 19,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Amount** $230,500.00

Charter Schools deliverables shall have a unit price of a blended rate of $170.00 per hour. All invoices shall specifically list the actual number of hours expended, the work accomplished during the time and the person who expended such time.

All bills and invoices shall specify the line item, as shown above, that is responsible for the funding of such work.

2. Fees include typing the single audit reports, management letters and the CAFR issued by the County and reported upon by KPMG.

3. It is agreed that as work progresses, KPMG shall render separate bills for services performed. Such billing shall identify the amount and expenses incurred during the prior month for both County and CSCD and the audit line item to be charged. Each entity shall pay such bills within 30 days of receipt.”

**Section XIII. Incorporated Documents** of the Original Contract, as amended, is deleted and the following is substituted:

“XIII. Incorporated Documents
The following documents are incorporated by reference as if fully reproduced herein:

A. The Engagement Letter to County from KPMG dated August 27, 2003 regarding the services provided to enable the County to comply with the Single Audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations and with the Federal and State of Texas Single Audit Circular (Federal and State Single Audit) in accordance with the Federal and Texas State Uniform Grant Management Standards, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

B. The Engagement Letter to County from KPMG dated August 27, 2003 regarding the audit of the financial statements of the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Charter School as of and for the year ending August 31, 2003, in accordance with Texas Education Agency (TEA) guidelines, attached hereto as Exhibit B.

C. The Engagement Letter to County from KPMG dated August 27, 2003 regarding the audit of the combined statement of financial position – regulatory basis of the Community Supervision and Corrections Department of Dallas County, Texas (CSCD), and the related combined statements of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance – regulatory basis for the year then ended, attached hereto as Exhibit C."

Section XIV. Order of Precedence of the Original Contract, as amended, is deleted and the following is substituted:

"XIV. Order of Precedence

In the event of any conflicts or inconsistencies between or among the provisions of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, the Original Contract, as amended, any incorporated or referenced document or any exhibit, amendment, attachment or associated document, such conflicts or inconsistencies shall be resolved in the following order of precedence: (1) this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, including the Engagement Letters, and any subsequent amendments; and (2) the Original Contract, as approved by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2000-1774 dated September 5, 2000, as amended by Contract Amendment and Extension No. 1, as authorized by Dallas County Commissioners Court Order No. 2002-1896 dated October 15, 2002, each of which are incorporated herein by reference as if fully reproduced, word for word, and number for number."

Section XIX. Insurance of the Original Contract, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

XIX. Insurance

KPMG, at its sole cost and expense, shall extend and maintain all required insurance coverage and bonds during the extended term of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, and shall include County as a certificate holder on its errors and omissions insurance policy and any other required insurance policies as applicable. Upon execution of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2, KPMG shall furnish to County certificates of insurance evidencing such insurance during the term of this Contract Amendment No. 2.
XX.

By their signatures below, the representatives of County and KPMG executing this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 represent that they are duly authorized to execute this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 on behalf of their party and to validly bind their party to all terms, conditions, performances and provisions set forth herein.

The duly authorized representatives of County and KPMG accept the terms of this Contract Amendment and Extension No. 2 in full.

EXECUTED this the _______ day of ______________________, 2003.

DALLAS COUNTY:

BY: Margaret Keliher
    Dallas County Judge

KPMG, LLP:

BY: William P. Hanley, Partner
    KPMG, LLP

DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTIONS:

BY: Ron Goethals, Director
    Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections

RECOMMENDED:

BY: Virginia Porter
    Dallas County Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM*:

BY: Janet R. Ferguson, Chief, Civil Section
    Dallas County District Attorney’s Office

*By law, the District Attorney’s Office may only advise or approve contracts or legal documents on behalf of its clients. It may not advise or approve a contract or legal document on behalf of other parties. Our review of this document was conducted solely from the legal perspective of our client. Our approval of this document was offered solely for the benefit of our client. Other parties should not rely on this approval, and should seek review and approval by their own respective attorney(s).
Virginia Porter  
County Auditor  
Dallas County, Texas  
509 Main Street, Suite 407  
Dallas, Texas 75202  

August 27, 2003  

Dear Ms. Porter:  

PRIVATE  

This letter will confirm KPMG LLP's (KPMG) understanding of our engagement to report upon our audit of the basic financial statements of Dallas County, Texas (the County) as of and for the year ending September 30, 2003, and the nature and scope of the services we will provide to enable the County to comply with the Single Audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations (OMB Circular A-133) and with the requirements of the State of Texas Single Audit Circular (State Single Audit) in accordance with the State Uniform Grant Management Standards.  

Financial Statement Audit  

We will conduct the audit of the basic financial statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards for financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The objective of an audit carried out in accordance with such standards is the expression of an opinion as to whether the presentation of the basic financial statements, taken as a whole, conforms with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. In conducting the audit, we will perform tests of the accounting records and such other procedures as we consider necessary in the circumstances to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion on the basic financial statements. We also will assess the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall basic financial statement presentation.
Our report will be addressed to the Commissioners’ Court (the Court) of the County. We cannot provide assurance that an unqualified opinion will be rendered. Circumstances may arise in which it is necessary for us to modify our report or withdraw from the engagement. In such circumstances, our findings or reasons for withdrawal will be communicated to the Court.

Should the County wish to include these basic financial statements in a document offering securities and request that we agree to include our report on these basic financial statements in the offering document, we would consider agreeing to the inclusion of our report at that time.

The management of the County has responsibility for the basic financial statements and all representations contained therein. Management also has responsibility for preventing and detecting fraud, for adopting sound accounting policies and establishing and maintaining effective internal control to maintain the reliability of the basic financial statements and to provide reasonable assurance against the possibility of misstatements that are material to the basic financial statements.

Our audit is planned and performed to obtain reasonable, but not absolute assurance about whether the basic financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether caused by error or fraud. Absolute assurance is not attainable because of the nature of audit evidence and the characteristics of fraud. Therefore, there is a risk that material errors, fraud (including fraud that may be an illegal act), and other illegal acts may exist and not be detected by an audit performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Also, an audit is not designed to detect matters that are immaterial to the basic financial statements.

To the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform management about any material errors and any instances of fraud or illegal acts. Further, to the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform the Court about fraud and illegal acts that involve senior management, fraud that in our judgment causes a material misstatement of the basic financial statements of the County, and illegal acts, unless clearly inconsequential, that have not otherwise been communicated to the Court. In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we are also required in certain circumstances to report fraud or illegal acts directly to parties outside the auditee.
In planning and performing our audit, we will consider the County's internal control in order to determine the nature, timing and extent of our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the basic financial statements and not to provide assurance on internal control. This consideration contributes to the evidence supporting our opinion on the basic financial statements; however, it does not provide a basis for opining on internal control. The limited purpose of this consideration may not meet the needs of some users who require additional information about internal control. We can provide other services to provide you with additional information on internal control which we would be happy to discuss with you at your convenience.

Management is responsible for identifying and ensuring compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the County. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the basic financial statements are free of material misstatement, we will perform tests of the County's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grants. However, our objective is not to provide an opinion on overall compliance with such provisions.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we will prepare a written report on our consideration of internal control and tests of compliance made as part of our audit of the basic financial statements. This report will include any reportable conditions to the extent they come to our attention. Reportable conditions are significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control which could adversely affect the County's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the basic financial statements under audit.

**OMB Circular A-133 and State Single Audit**

We will also perform audit procedures with respect to the County's major federal and state programs in accordance with the provisions of OMB Circular A-133 and the State of Texas Single Audit. OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit include specific audit requirements, mainly in the areas of internal control and compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants, that exceed those required by Government Auditing Standards.
As part of our audit procedures performed in accordance with the provisions of OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit, we will perform tests to evaluate the effectiveness of the design and operation of internal controls that we consider relevant to preventing or detecting material noncompliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to each of the County's major programs. The tests of internal control performed in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit are less in scope than would be necessary to render an opinion on internal control.

Compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to federal and state programs is the responsibility of management. We will perform tests of the County's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grants we determine to be necessary based on the OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement (Compliance Supplement) and the State Uniform Grant Management Standards (Uniform Standards). The procedures outlined in the Compliance Supplement and the Uniform Standards are those suggested by each federal or state agency and do not cover all areas of regulations governing each program. Program reviews by federal or state agencies may identify additional instances of noncompliance.

As required by OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit, we will prepare written reports which (1) provide our opinion on the schedules of expenditures of federal and state awards in relation to the County's basic financial statements taken as a whole, (2) provide our opinion on compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grant that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal or state program and (3) communicate our consideration of internal control over major federal and state programs.

In addition to the OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit requirements to maintain internal control and comply with provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to federal and state programs as discussed above, OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit also require the County to prepare a:

- Schedule of expenditures of federal and state awards;
- Summary schedule of prior audit findings;
- Corrective action plan; and
- Data collection form (Part I).
While we may be separately engaged to assist you in the preparation of these items, preparation is the responsibility of the County.

Certain provisions of OMB Circular A-133 and the State Single Audit allow a granting agency to request that a specific program be selected as a major program provided that the federal or state granting agency is willing to pay the incremental audit cost arising from such selection. The County agrees to notify KPMG LLP of any such request by a granting agency and to work with KPMG LLP to modify the terms of this letter as necessary to accommodate such a request.

Other Engagement Issues

Our reports on internal control and on compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants will indicate that they are intended solely for the information and use of the Court and management of the County and federal and state awarding agencies and pass-through entities and are not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

The County agrees that all records, documentation, and information we request in connection with our audit will be made available to us, that all material information will be disclosed to us, and that we will have the full cooperation of the County’s personnel. As required by auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we will make specific inquiries of management about the representations embodied in the basic financial statements and the effectiveness of internal control, and obtain a representation letter from management about these matters. The responses to our inquiries, the written representations, and the results of audit tests comprise the evidential matter we will rely upon in forming an opinion on the basic financial statements.

Management is responsible for adjusting the basic financial statements to correct material misstatements and for affirming to us in the representation letter that the effects of any unrecorded misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the basic financial statements being reported upon taken as a whole. Because of the importance of management’s representations to the effective performance of our services, the County agrees to release KPMG LLP and its personnel from any claims, liabilities,
costs and expenses relating to our services under this letter attributable to any misrepresentations in the representation letter referred to above.

The work papers for this engagement are the property of KPMG LLP. Pursuant to Government Auditing Standards, we are required to make certain work papers available to regulatory agencies upon request for their reviews of audit quality and for use by their auditors. In addition, we may be requested to make certain work papers available to regulators pursuant to authority given to it by law or regulation. Access to the requested work papers will be provided under supervision of KPMG personnel. Furthermore, upon request, we may provide photocopies of selected work papers to regulatory agencies. These regulatory agencies may intend, or decide, to distribute the photocopies or information contained therein to others, including other government agencies.

Appendix I to this letter lists the additional reports we expect to issue as part of this engagement.

While the audit report may be sent to the County electronically by the KPMG engagement partner for the County's convenience, only the signed (electronically or manually) report constitutes the County's record copy.

Based upon our discussions with and representations of the County, we estimate that our fees will approximate $101,500, including out-of-pocket expenses for the financial audit of the County and $61,000 for the federal and state single audits. Additionally, fees for the financial audit of the Criminal Justice Department funds administered by the Community Supervision and Corrections Department will be $19,500 and the fees for the financial audit of the Dallas County funds administered by the Dallas County Juvenile Probation Department will be $12,500. Circumstances encountered during the performance of these services that warrant additional time or expense could cause us to be unable to complete the audit within the above estimates. We will endeavor to notify you of any such circumstances as they are assessed.
Note: All fees for audit services include a 3% CPI increase from prior year fees. In addition, the financial statement audit and the OMB A-133 and State Single Audit, also include an approximate 12% increase related to the increased time and efforts required to comply with SAS 99 and SAS 96, as indicated below, in our audits of the County's financial statements. Furthermore, the TJPC audit also includes an approximate 12% increase related to the increased time and efforts required to comply with the additional TJPC audit requirements as described below.

In 2002, the Auditing Standards Board (ASB) issued Statement on Auditing Standards No. 99, "Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit" (SAS No.99). This Statement establishes standards and provides guidance to auditors in fulfilling that responsibility, as it relates to fraud, in an audit of financial statements conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS). Also, in 2002, the ASB issued Statement on Auditing Standards No. 96, Audit Documentation (SAS 96). SAS 96 requires audit documentation to be sufficient to enable members of the engagement team with supervision and review responsibilities to understand the nature, timing, extent, and results of auditing procedures performed, and the evidence obtained.

As indicated above, the fees for the TJPC audit include a 3% CPI increase from prior year fees, and an approximate 12% increase related to the increased time and efforts required to comply with the additional TJPC audit requirements. Most notably, TJPC added audit requirements related to the testing of the Salary Adjustment Contract starting with fiscal year 2002. At a minimum 15 qualified positions and 10% of all juvenile probation officers receiving funding and 10% of all detention or correction officers receiving funding is required to be tested.

Therefore, additional time and efforts will be required to comply with these new standards and additional audit requirements. We estimate that there will be a 12% increase in the number of hours required by KPMG to comply with these new standards and audit requirements.

Note: Our fees for the OMB A-133 and State Single Audit are based on the auditing of an average of eight programs combined. Circumstances encountered during the planning and performance of Single Audit that warrant the selection of more than eight programs or additional programs could cause us to be unable to complete the audit within the above estimates. Each program in excess of eight selected for audit according to the OMB Circular A-133 Compliance
Supplement and State Uniform Grant Management Standards will be billed at a rate of $6,500 per program. We will endeavor to notify you of any such circumstances as they are assessed.

Invoices will be sent to you on a bi-weekly basis as hours are incurred throughout the audit.

All invoices are due within 30 days of receipt.

In the event KPMG LLP is requested pursuant to subpoena or other legal process to produce its documents relating to this engagement in judicial or administrative proceedings to which KPMG LLP is not a party, the County shall reimburse KPMG LLP at standard billing rates for its professional time and expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, incurred in responding to such request.

As required by Government Auditing Standards, we have attached a copy of KPMG LLP’s most recent peer review report.

We shall be pleased to discuss this letter with you at any time. For your convenience in confirming these arrangements, we enclose a copy of this letter. Please sign and return it to us.

Very truly yours,

KPMG LLP

William P. Hanley
Partner
Appendix I

Other reports to be issued pursuant to this engagement letter:

- Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Contract Funds (TJPC) for August 31, 2003

- Texas Department of Criminal Justice Assistance Division programs (CJAD) of Dallas County for the year ended August 31, 2003

  - As it relates to audit of the Combined Statements of financial position – regulatory basis of the Community Supervision and Corrections Department of Dallas County, Texas (the CSCD) as of August 31, 2003, and the related combined statement of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance – regulatory basis for the year then ended:
    - The audit will cover the 12-month period of September 1, 2002 through August 31, 2003.
    - The audit opinion expressed will state whether the reports are presented in accordance with TDCJ-CJAD reporting requirements.
    - TDCJ staff and/or State Auditor staff will be granted reasonable access to the working papers upon written request.
    - Audit working papers will be retained for at least three (3) years from the date of the audit report.
To the Partners of KPMG LLP
and the SEC Practice Section Peer Review Committee:

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP (the firm) in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002. A system of quality control encompasses the firm’s organizational structure and the policies adopted and procedures established to provide it with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. The elements of quality control are described in the Statements on Quality Control Standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the AICPA). The design of the system, and compliance with it, are the responsibilities of the firm. In addition, the firm has agreed to comply with the membership requirements of the SEC Practice Section of the AICPA Division for CPA Firms (the Section). Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system, and the firm’s compliance with that system and the Section’s membership requirements based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with standards established by the Peer Review Committee of the Section and included procedures to plan and perform the review that are summarized in the attached description of the peer review process. Our review would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system of quality control or all instances of lack of compliance with it or with the membership requirements of the Section since it was based on selective tests. Because there are inherent limitations in the effectiveness of any system of quality control, departures from the system may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of a system of quality control to future periods is subject to the risk that the system of quality control may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002, has been designed to meet the requirements of the quality control standards for an accounting and auditing practice established by the AICPA, and was complied with during the year then ended to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. Also, in our opinion, the firm complied during that year with the membership requirements of the Section in all material respects.

As is customary in a peer review, we have issued a letter under this date that sets forth comments relating to certain policies and procedures or compliance with them. The matters described in the letter were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the opinion expressed in this report.

October 28, 2002
Ms. Virginia Porter
County Auditor
County of Dallas
407 Records Building
Dallas, TX 75202

August 27, 2003

Dear Ms. Porter:

PRIVATE

This letter will confirm KPMG LLP's (KPMG) understanding of our engagement to report upon our audit of the financial statements of the Dallas County Juvenile Justice Charter School (the Charter School) as of and for the year ending August 31, 2003, and to comply with Texas Education Agency (TEA) guidelines.

Financial Statement Audit

We will conduct the audit of the financial statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards for financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and in accordance with Texas Education Agency guidelines. The objective of an audit carried out in accordance with such standards is the expression of an opinion as to whether the presentation of the financial statements, taken as a whole, conforms with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. In conducting the audit, we will perform tests of the accounting records and such other procedures as we consider necessary in the circumstances to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion on the financial statements. We also will assess the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall financial statement presentation.

Our report will be addressed to the Dallas County Juvenile Board (the Board). We cannot provide assurance that an unqualified opinion will be rendered. Circumstances may arise in which it is necessary for us to modify our report or withdraw from the engagement. In such circumstances, our findings or reasons for withdrawal will be communicated to the Board.

Should Dallas County wish to include these financial statements in a document offering securities and request that we agree to include our report on these financial statements in the offering document, we would consider agreeing to the inclusion of our report at that time.
The management of the Charter School has responsibility for the financial statements and all representations contained therein. Management also has responsibility for preventing and detecting fraud, for adopting sound accounting policies and establishing and maintaining effective internal control to maintain the reliability of the financial statements and to provide reasonable assurance against the possibility of misstatements that are material to the financial statements.

Our audit is planned and performed to obtain reasonable, but not absolute assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether caused by error or fraud. Absolute assurance is not attainable because of the nature of audit evidence and the characteristics of fraud. Therefore, there is a risk that material errors, fraud (including fraud that may be an illegal act), and other illegal acts may exist and not be detected by an audit performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Also, an audit is not designed to detect matters that are immaterial to the financial statements.

To the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform management about any material errors and any instances of fraud or illegal acts. Further, to the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform the Board about fraud and illegal acts that involve senior management, fraud that in our judgment causes a material misstatement of the financial statements of the Charter School, and illegal acts, unless clearly inconsequential, that have not otherwise been communicated to the Board. In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we are also required in certain circumstances to report fraud or illegal acts directly to parties outside the auditee.

In planning and performing our audit, we will consider the Charter School’s internal control in order to determine the nature, timing and extent of our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the financial statements and not to provide assurance on internal control. This consideration contributes to the evidence supporting our opinion on the financial statements; however, it does not provide a basis for opining on internal control. The limited purpose of this consideration may not meet the needs of some users who require additional information about internal control. We can provide other services to provide you with additional information on internal control which we would be happy to discuss with you at your convenience.

Management is responsible for identifying and ensuring compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the Charter School. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, we will perform tests of the Charter School’s compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grants. However, our objective is not to provide an opinion on overall compliance with such provisions.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we will prepare a written report on our consideration of internal control and tests of compliance made as part of our audit of the financial
statements. This report will include any reportable conditions to the extent they come to our attention. Reportable conditions are significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control which could adversely affect the Charter School’s ability to record, process, summarize and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statements under audit.

**Agreed Upon Procedures**

We will also perform certain agreed upon procedures for the purpose of reviewing the accuracy of the fiscal information provided by the Charter School through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), as requested by Section 44.08b of the Texas Education Code.

**Other Engagement Issues**

Our report on internal control and on compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants will indicate that it is intended solely for the information and use of the Board and management of the Charter School and state awarding agencies and that it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Dallas County agrees that all records, documentation, and information we request in connection with our audit will be made available to us, that all material information will be disclosed to us, and that we will have the full cooperation of Dallas County’s personnel. As required by auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we will make specific inquiries of management about the representations embodied in the financial statements and the effectiveness of internal control, and obtain a representation letter from management about these matters. The responses to our inquiries, the written representations, and the results of audit tests comprise the evidential matter we will rely upon in forming an opinion on the financial statements.

Management is responsible for adjusting the financial statements to correct material misstatements and for affirming to us in the representation letter that the effects of any unrecorded misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements being reported upon taken as a whole. Because of the importance of management’s representations to the effective performance of our services, Dallas County agrees to release KPMG LLP and its personnel from any claims, liabilities, costs and expenses relating to our services under this letter attributable to any misrepresentations in the representation letter referred to above.

The work papers for this engagement are the property of KPMG LLP. Pursuant to *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to make certain work papers available to regulatory agencies.
upon request for their reviews of audit quality and for use by their auditors. In addition, we may be requested to make certain work papers available to a regulator pursuant to authority given to it by law or regulation. Access to the requested work papers will be provided under supervision of KPMG personnel. Furthermore, upon request, we may provide photocopies of selected work papers to regulatory agencies. These regulatory agencies may intend, or decide, to distribute the photocopies or information contained therein to others, including other government agencies.

While the audit report may be sent to Dallas County electronically by the KPMG engagement partner for Dallas County's convenience, only the signed (electronically or manually) report constitutes the County's record copy.

We will also assist management in drafting the financial statements and notes. In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we are required to confirm that management accepts responsibility for the financial statements and notes and, therefore, has a responsibility to be in a position in fact and appearance to make an informed judgment about them and that management will:

- Designate a qualified management-level individual to be responsible and accountable for overseeing the drafting of the financial statements.

- Establish and monitor the performance of the engagement to ensure that it meets management’s objectives.

- Make any decisions that involve management functions related to the engagement and accept full responsibility for such decisions.

- Evaluate the adequacy of the financial statements and notes.

Based upon our discussions with and representations of management, we estimate that our fees will approximate $36,000 based on a blended hourly rate of $170. We will bill the County for each hour incurred at the agreed blended rate. This estimate is based on the level of experience of the individuals who will perform the services. In addition, expenses for travel will be billed for reimbursement as incurred. Circumstances encountered during the performance of these services that warrant additional time or expenses could cause us to be unable to complete the audit within the above estimates. We will endeavor to notify you of any such circumstances as they are assessed.

Invoices will be sent to Dallas County on a bi-weekly basis as hours and/or expenses are incurred and are due within 30 days of receipt.
Ms. Virginia Porter
August 27, 2003
Page 5

In the event KPMG LLP is requested pursuant to subpoena or other legal process to produce its
documents relating to this engagement in judicial or administrative proceedings to which KPMG
LLP is not a party, Dallas County shall reimburse KPMG LLP at standard billing rates for its
professional time and expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, incurred in responding to such
request.

As required by Government Auditing Standards, we have attached a copy of KPMG LLP’s most
recent peer review report.

We shall be pleased to discuss this letter with you at any time. For your convenience in confirming
these arrangements, we enclose a copy of this letter. Please sign and return it to us.

Very truly yours,

KPMG LLP

[Signature]

William P. Hanley
Partner
Ms. Virginia Porter
August 27, 2003
Page 6

ACCEPTED:

County of Dallas

__________________________________________
Authorized Signature

__________________________________________
Title

__________________________________________
Date
To the Partners of KPMG LLP
and the SEC Practice Section Peer Review Committee:

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP (the firm) in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002. A system of quality control encompasses the firm's organizational structure and the policies adopted and procedures established to provide it with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. The elements of quality control are described in the Statements on Quality Control Standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the AICPA). The design of the system, and compliance with it, are the responsibilities of the firm. In addition, the firm has agreed to comply with the membership requirements of the SEC Practice Section of the AICPA Division for CPA Firms (the Section). Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system, and the firm's compliance with that system and the Section's membership requirements based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with standards established by the Peer Review Committee of the Section and included procedures to plan and perform the review that are summarized in the attached description of the peer review process. Our review would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system of quality control or all instances of lack of compliance with it or with the membership requirements of the Section since it was based on selective tests. Because there are inherent limitations in the effectiveness of any system of quality control, departures from the system may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of a system of quality control to future periods is subject to the risk that the system of quality control may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002, has been designed to meet the requirements of the quality control standards for an accounting and auditing practice established by the AICPA, and was complied with during the year then ended to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. Also, in our opinion, the firm complied during that year with the membership requirements of the Section in all material respects.

As is customary in a peer review, we have issued a letter under this date that sets forth comments relating to certain policies and procedures or compliance with them. The matters described in the letter were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the opinion expressed in this report.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

October 28, 2002
August 27, 2003

Dear Ms. Porter:

PRIVATE

This letter will confirm KPMG LLP’s (KPMG) understanding of our engagement to report upon our audit of the combined statement of financial position - regulatory basis of the Community Supervision and Corrections Department of Dallas County, Texas (the CSCD) as of August 31, 2003, and the related combined statement of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance - regulatory basis for the year then ended.

We will conduct the audit of the combined financial statements - regulatory basis in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards for financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The objective of an audit carried out in accordance with such standards is the expression of an opinion as to whether the presentation of the combined financial statements, taken as a whole, conforms with the prescribed regulatory basis of accounting. In conducting the audit, we will perform tests of the accounting records and such other procedures as we consider necessary in the circumstances to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion on the combined financial statements - regulatory basis. We also will assess the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall combined financial statement presentation.

Our report will be addressed to the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (the Department) of the County. We cannot provide assurance that an unqualified opinion will be rendered. Circumstances may arise in which it is necessary for us to modify our report or withdraw from the engagement. In such circumstances, our findings or reasons for withdrawal will be communicated to the Department.

Should the CSCD wish to include these combined financial statements in a document offering securities and request that we agree to include our report on these combined financial statements in the offering document, we would consider agreeing to the inclusion of our report at that time.
The management of the CSCD has responsibility for the combined financial statements—regulatory basis and all representations contained therein. Management also has responsibility for preventing and detecting fraud, for adopting sound accounting policies and establishing and maintaining effective internal control to maintain the reliability of the combined financial statements—regulatory basis and to provide reasonable assurance against the possibility of misstatements that are material to the combined financial statements.

Our audit is planned and performed to obtain reasonable, but not absolute assurance about whether the combined financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether caused by error or fraud. Absolute assurance is not attainable because of the nature of audit evidence and the characteristics of fraud. Therefore, there is a risk that material errors, fraud (including fraud that may be an illegal act), and other illegal acts may exist and not be detected by an audit performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Also, an audit is not designed to detect matters that are immaterial to the combined financial statements.

To the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform management about any material errors and any instances of fraud or illegal acts. Further, to the extent that they come to our attention, we will inform the CSCD about fraud and illegal acts that involve senior management, fraud that in our judgment causes a material misstatement of the combined financial statements of the CSCD, and illegal acts, unless clearly inconsequential, that have not otherwise been communicated to the CSCD. In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we are also required in certain circumstances to report fraud or illegal acts directly to parties outside the auditee.

In planning and performing our audit, we will consider the CSCD’s internal control in order to determine the nature, timing and extent of our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the combined financial statements—regulatory basis and not to provide assurance on internal control. This consideration contributes to the evidence supporting our opinion on the combined financial statements—regulatory basis; however, it does not provide a basis for opining on internal control. The limited purpose of this consideration may not meet the needs of some users who require additional information about internal control. We can provide other services to provide you with additional information on internal control, which we would be happy to discuss with you at your convenience.

Management is responsible for identifying and ensuring compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the CSCD. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the combined financial statements—regulatory basis are free of material misstatement, we will perform tests of the CSCD’s compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations,
contracts and grants. However, our objective is not to provide an opinion on overall compliance with such provisions.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we will prepare a written report on our consideration of internal control and tests of compliance made as part of our audit of the combined financial statements. This report will include any reportable conditions to the extent they come to our attention. Reportable conditions are significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control, which could adversely affect the CSCD’s ability to record, process, summarize and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statements under audit. Our report on internal control and on compliance with laws, regulations, contracts and grants will indicate that it is intended solely for the information and use of the CSCD and management of the CSCD and state awarding agency and that it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

The CSCD agrees that all records, documentation, and information we request in connection with our audit will be made available to us, that all material information will be disclosed to us, and that we will have the full cooperation of the CSCD’s personnel. As required by auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we will make specific inquiries of management about the representations embodied in the combined financial statements - regulatory basis and the effectiveness of internal control, and obtain a representation letter from management about these matters. The responses to our inquiries, the written representations, and the results of audit tests comprise the evidential matter we will rely upon in forming an opinion on the combined financial statements - regulatory basis.

Management is responsible for adjusting the combined financial statements to correct material misstatements and for affirming to us in the representation letter that the effects of any unrecorded misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the combined financial statements - regulatory basis taken as a whole. Because of the importance of management’s representations to the effective performance of our services, the CSCD agrees to release KPMG LLP and its personnel from any claims, liabilities, costs and expenses relating to our services under this letter attributable to any misrepresentations in the representation letter referred to above.

The work papers for this engagement are the property of KPMG LLP. These work papers will be retained for at least three (3) years from the date of the audit report. Pursuant to Government Auditing Standards, we are required to make certain work papers available to regulatory agencies upon request for their reviews of audit quality and for use by their auditors. In addition, we may be requested to make certain work papers available to regulators pursuant to authority given to
them by law or regulation. Access to the requested work papers will be provided under supervision of KPMG personnel. Particularly, TDCJ staff and/or State Auditor staff will be granted reasonable access to the working papers upon written request. Furthermore, upon request, we may provide photocopies of selected work papers to regulatory agencies. These regulatory agencies may intend, or decide, to distribute the photocopies or information contained therein to others, including other government agencies.

While the audit report may be sent to the CSCD electronically by the KPMG partner for the CSCD’s convenience, only the signed (electronically or manually) report constitutes the CSCD’s record copy.

Based upon our discussions with and representations of CSCD, we estimate that our fees will approximate $19,500. Circumstances encountered during the performance of these services that warrant additional time or expense could cause us to be unable to complete the audit within the above estimates. We will endeavor to notify you of any such circumstances as they are assessed.

All invoices are due within 30 days of receipt.

In the event KPMG LLP is requested pursuant to subpoena or other legal process to produce its documents relating to this engagement in judicial or administrative proceedings to which KPMG LLP is not a party, the CSCD shall reimburse KPMG LLP at standard billing rates for its professional time and expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, incurred in responding to such request.

As required by Government Auditing Standards, we have attached a copy of KPMG LLP’s most recent peer review report.

We shall be pleased to discuss this letter with you at any time. For your convenience in confirming these arrangements, we enclose a copy of this letter. Please sign and return it to us.

Very truly yours,

KPMG LLP

[Signature]

William P. Hanley
Partner
To the Partners of KPMG LLP
and the SEC Practice Section Peer Review Committee:

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP (the firm) in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002. A system of quality control encompasses the firm’s organizational structure and the policies adopted and procedures established to provide it with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. The elements of quality control are described in the Statements on Quality Control Standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the AICPA). The design of the system, and compliance with it, are the responsibilities of the firm. In addition, the firm has agreed to comply with the membership requirements of the SEC Practice Section of the AICPA Division for CPA Firms (the Section). Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system, and the firm’s compliance with that system and the Section’s membership requirements based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with standards established by the Peer Review Committee of the Section and included procedures to plan and perform the review that are summarized in the attached description of the peer review process. Our review would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system of quality control or all instances of lack of compliance with it or with the membership requirements of the Section since it was based on selective tests. Because there are inherent limitations in the effectiveness of any system of quality control, departures from the system may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of a system of quality control to future periods is subject to the risk that the system of quality control may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002, has been designed to meet the requirements of the quality control standards for an accounting and auditing practice established by the AICPA, and was complied with during the year then ended to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. Also, in our opinion, the firm complied during that year with the membership requirements of the Section in all material respects.

As is customary in a peer review, we have issued a letter under this date that sets forth comments relating to certain policies and procedures or compliance with them. The matters described in the letter were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the opinion expressed in this report.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

MAJOR TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS REVIEW

November 2003

Review Meeting: November 4, 2003
Briefing Session
Commissioners Courtroom
## Major Technology Review

11/3/2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Technology Fund</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>eGovernment Portal</td>
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<tr>
<td>Truancy Courts</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Infrastructure Upgrade</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff's Imaging Expansion</td>
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Major Technology Fund 5-Year Plan Summary

11/3/2003

PROPOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>4,510,984</td>
<td>1,407,369</td>
<td>767,056</td>
<td>6,640,753</td>
<td>13,543,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue - Property Tax</td>
<td>6,183,883</td>
<td>6,255,831</td>
<td>6,380,947</td>
<td>6,508,565</td>
<td>6,638,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings / Interfund Trans.</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>57,750</td>
<td>89,505</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment from General Fund</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,789,877</td>
<td>8,749,200</td>
<td>8,235,753</td>
<td>14,238,823</td>
<td>21,277,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Years Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Courts System Replacement</td>
<td>5,287,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Urban Counties</td>
<td>61,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal / Warrants / Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Upgrade 11i</td>
<td>2,042,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Equipment</td>
<td>249,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Personnel</td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Case Billing</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce Expansion</td>
<td>203,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Crime Lab Evidence Track</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>151,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Clerk Imaging</td>
<td>618,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Connectivity/GroupWise Upg</td>
<td>88,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff Intake</td>
<td>221,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan to General Fund</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>7,269,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENDING BALANCE

|                   | 1,407,369  | 767,056    | 6,640,753  | 13,543,823 | 20,582,559 |

Reserve Target (10% of Expenditures)

|                   | 938,251    | 798,214    | 159,500    | 69,500     | 69,500     |
Major Technology Review
11/03/03

PROJECT NAME
Civil Courts Case Management System

PROJECT MANAGER
John Hennessey

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Implement a Civil/JP Courts System

BRIEFING DATE
06/24/03 Extend response deadline to 7/7/03

PROJECT COST
Original Estimate
Modified
$11 million
$7.7 million

SCHEDULING
Start
07/02/02
Finish
02/02/04

USE OF FUNDS
Hardware
Software
Services

COMMENTS
3 site visits have been completed. 11 County staff and Stan Reid of CIRA visited Marion County, FL (Tiburon), Orange County, FL (Court Specialists) and The State of Minnesota (The Software Group). Site visit findings to be consolidated by 11/3/03. JP subgroup reviewing JP specs. JP reference checks to be completed by 11/7/03.
# Major Technology Review

**PROJECT NAME**: Automate Traffic Citation System  
**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**: IT Services

**PROJECT MANAGER**: Rodney Christian

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**: Purchase and implement an automated citation system that will use handheld ticketing devices to print and capture citations. Interface the new system with the current County systems.

## BRIEFING DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COURT ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COURT ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COURT ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 person months</td>
<td>12/15/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 person months for Issuance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 person months for Payments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCHEDULING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>01/01/01</td>
<td>10/01/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP / BAFO</td>
<td>03/29/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>05/31/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install</td>
<td>08/30/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>09/13/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>$536,297</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Time Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMENTS

Units updated for new fees. Researching process to automate the printing of the complaint forms. Top 10 offenses identified with speeding accounting for 80%. There are 6 variations of the speeding form.

Updated the ETEC software to the latest version (V1.17). Preparing to add Judge Blackington to the program.
**PROJECT NAME**  
Juvenile Information System

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**  
Juvenile

**PROJECT MANAGER**  
Ron Stretcher

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**  
Integrated Juvenile Justice Information System funded by JAIBG  
Year 2 ($1,869,072)  
Year 3 ($1,814,142)  
Year 4 ($1,917,693)  
Year 5 ($1,612,232)

**BRIEFING DATE**  
06/24/03 Year 5 awarded to Infolntegration  
08/05/03 Year 5 Grant Award

**COURT ORDER**  
07/15/03  
08/05/03

**PROJECT COST**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>$1,323,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>07/01/03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>06/30/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,323,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**  
78 certified agencies in production. 40 Police agencies, 15 School districts, 14 Municipal Courts and 9 County Agencies.  
35 agencies using JIS as primary system. 1957 users trained.  
Transition completed to Infolntegration.  
Arrests filed YTD 3941, Offenses filed YTD 9752  
September stats: Arrests 694, Offenses 1065, Electronic filings to DA 53, electronic school notifications 154.  
Begin working with new Truancy Courts to integrate them into JIS.  
Schlumberger has developed a proposal to assume operational support of the JIS system.
Major Technology Review
11/03/03

PROJECT NAME: eGovernment
PROJECT MANAGER: John Hennessey
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Implement a full service electronic government internet portal

BRIEFING DATE: 08/22/00

PROJECT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>08/22/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEDULING

| Start       | 09/12/00 | 01/02/01 |
| Completion  | 03/30/01 | 01/02/04 |

USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS
TLI is only performing basic operations of the web site. NO NEW development.
All projects are on hold. County staff performing user requested maintenance.
DA has completed review of TLI Transition Agreement. Proposal is to retain
TLI thru mid-February (end of Tax Payment season).
Motor Vehicle registration Renewal shifted to TexaOnline.
Adding informational section about GACB construction.
**Major Technology Review**  
11/03/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Information System</td>
<td>Commissioners Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT MANAGER**

John Hennessey

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Implement an Adult Information System

**BRIEFING DATE**

06/24/03 Year 3 awarded to Infolntegration

**PROJECT COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>$333,333</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>07/01/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>08/30/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>$333,333</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

Transition to Infolntegration has been completed.  
Year 3 tasks identified. Expanded governance structure developed.  
Full governance meeting held in October.  
Year 3 grant award received from CJD. Public Hearing held.  
This project has been combined with JIS for contract administration purposes.
Major Technology Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Filing</td>
<td>Commissioners Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hennessey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the electronic filing of cases with Dallas County via TexasOnline State Portal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIEFING DATE</th>
<th>COURT ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE OF FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TexasOnline/KPMG held initial meeting in Austin to preview project. Pilots are Bexar and Fort Bend Counties. Fort Bend is now live on system. System requires a case management system to obtain maximum benefits. There are fees associated with filing cases via TexasOnline. Current rate structure is $6.00 per filing with $2.00 to County, $3.40 to Electronic Filing Service Provider and $0.60 to TexasOnline. Fees must be approved by TexasOnline Authority. Recommend that Dallas County investigate becoming an Electronic Filing Service Provider. County Court local rules have been approved by Texas Supreme Court. 3 computers and printers to be ordered. Programming resource required to modify the receipting system for the new fee. Technical meetings held between County and BearingPoint/TexasOnline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Technology Review
11/03/03

PROJECT NAME
Kronos XP Upgrade

RESPONSIBLE DEPT
Commissioners Court

PROJECT MANAGER
Rodney Christian

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Upgrade Kronos to be compatible with Windows XP

BRIEFING DATE
01/21/03 Brief Assessment $6,440
07/22/03 Brief Upgrade $44,225

COURT ORDER
2003-0179 01/28/03
2003-1341 7/29/2003

PROJECT COST
Original Estimate $50,000
Modified

DATE
01/21/03

SCHEDULING
Start 02/01/03
Completion 10/01/03

USE OF FUNDS
Original
Current
Variance

Hardware $7,300
Software no charge
Services $42,700

COMMENTS
Kronos has completed assessment and it has been reviewed by IT and the auditor.
Copy of data sent to Kronos. Kronos to provide upgraded database by end of October
for testing by County. County resources are scheduled to be available beginning
January 2004 to test the upgraded Kronos data. Resource availability is constrained by
## Major Technology Review

**PROJECT NAME**
JP Projects

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**
IT Services

**PROJECT MANAGER**
Quinton Brown

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
Various JP projects: Collections, Failure to Appear, DA hot checks

**BRIEFING DATE**

**COURT ORDER**

**PROJECT COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>3 person months</th>
<th>12/15/00</th>
<th>Annual Workplan hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>01/01/01</td>
<td>06/29/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>09/30/01</td>
<td>11/28/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

Collections: On hold pending contract issues.
Failure to Appear: Programming specifications in development. Meeting to be scheduled with Omnibase. Omnibase requires VIN and plate numbers.
Internet Ticket Payments: Working with TLI to provide data to allow automated payments for traffic tickets.
E-filing of DISD Truancy cases: Working with DISD to e-file Truancy cases.
E-filing of DA hot check cases: Programming resource availability.
New Fees implemented 9/26/03 - more fees effective January 2004.
Major Technology Review
11/03/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUC Integrated Justice Information System</td>
<td>Commissioners Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Christian</td>
<td>Develop an Integrated Justice System Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIEFING DATE</th>
<th>COURT ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COST</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COURT ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Estimate</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>$154,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULING</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>06/01/03</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>04/01/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>$771,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP was issued in July with responses due 9/20/03. 7 compliant bids were received. 3 vendors identified as finalists. Following vendor interviews, 2 vendors were selected for Best and Final Offer stage. A final recommendation on vendor selection is expected to be made to the Oversight Board within a week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECT NAME**  
Law Library Improvements

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**  
Commissioners Court

**PROJECT MANAGER**  
Rodney Christian

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**  
Implement hardware and software upgrades to automate the library's collection and reference services.

**BRIEFING DATE**  
11/06/01 Funding approved

**COURT ORDER**  
2001-2132  
11/06/01

**PROJECT COST**  
| Original Estimate | Modified | DATE | $180,500 | 11/06/01 | ($233,598 total for construction, etc.) |

**SCHEDULING**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Network Plan</th>
<th>Choose Software</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/01/02</td>
<td>04/12/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/01/03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$180,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**  
RFP issued for software. RFPs were due 5/1/03.
4 responses received and 2 vendors identified as susceptible.
BAFO (Best and Final Offer) letters sent 8/28/03
BAFO responses due 10/17/03.
PROJECT NAME: UTMB Connectivity  
PROJECT MANAGER: John Hennessey  
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Provide technical assistance for UTMB Jail Contract Connectivity  
BRIEFING DATE:  
PROJECT COST:
   Original Estimate
   Modified
SCHEDULING:
   Start: 01/02/03
   Completion: 12/01/03
USE OF FUNDS:
   Hardware: $0
   Software: $0
   Services: $0
COMMENTS:
Network cable drops completed. Data circuits installed. PC installation nearly complete. Data extracts being created from mainframe to provide book-in information hourly. Additional extracts in development to provide TB and Mental Health information daily. UTMB has requested Juvenile data - not available from mainframe. Currently working with the Juvenile Department to provide the data either from the Juvenile Information System or from the Juvenile Caseworker system. Connectivity for a training area in the Kays facility has been completed. UTMB will reimburse County for cost ($1,000)
**Major Technology Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Connectivity</td>
<td>IT Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT MANAGER**

Vanessa King

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Research various options to provide full wireless connectivity to include access to email and attachments.

**BRIEFING DATE**

03/18/03 Brief Upgrade and Options

**COURT ORDER**

2003-559 04/01/03

**PROJECT COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>$125,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>04/01/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>07/31/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

PDAs and training have been provided to Court. Servers have been installed and GroupWise software upgrade is in progress. Due to GroupWise 6 software requirements, all servers had to have a software upgrade installed. The new GroupWise will be available to the majority of the county by 10/31/03 and will provide internet access to email. URL is webaccess.dallascounty.org
# Major Technology Review

**11/03/03**

## PROJECT NAME
Oracle 11i Migration

## RESPONSIBLE DEPT
Commissioners Court

## PROJECT MANAGER
John Hennessey

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Migrate the County to Oracle Financials Release 11i

## BRIEFING DATE
05/06/03 Brief Assessment

## COURT ORDER
$211,300 2003-1046

## PROJECT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
<td>05/02/03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCHEDULING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## COMMENTS
Assessment kickoff meeting held 7/9/03. Staff is now onsite.
11i demos held 8/26/03 for Purchasing, Treasurer, Auditor, Budget, and IT.
Meetings with Departments completed. The assessment report has been reviewed internally and is being revised based on IT recommendations. Next step is to present to the IT Steering Committee for review.
**Major Technology Review**

**PROJECT NAME**  
Strategic Plan

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**  
IT Services

**PROJECT MANAGER**  
Randy Powell

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**  
Develop a County Wide IT Strategic Plan as required by the IT Outsourcing Contract

**BRIEFING DATE**  

**COURT ORDER**  

**PROJECT COST**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**  
An initial draft of the Strategic Plan has been developed as a result of meetings with Commissioners Court and selected departments. The Plan will be briefed to Court in November to obtain information and guidance on further direction and refinement.
At the request of the Juvenile Department, Schlumberger is preparing an assessment proposal to determine the effort and costs to move the support of the Charter School network and desktop support to Schlumberger. The proposal will be presented to the Juvenile Board and then brief to the Court.
Major Technology Review

11/03/03

PROJECT NAME
Truancy Courts

RESPONSIBLE DEPT
IT Services

PROJECT MANAGER
Quinton Brown

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Add Truancy Courts to County Systems and expand functionality.

BRIEFING DATE

COURT ORDER

PROJECT COST

Original Estimate
Modified

PROJECT COST

DATE

SCHEDULING

Start
Completion

PLANNED

CURRENT

USE OF FUNDS

ORIGINAL
CURRENT
VARIANCE

Hardware
Software
Services

COMMENTS
3rd Truancy Court approved and operational 9/2/03.
Transition meeting held with City of Dallas. Transition plan agreed upon.
Truancy Courts transitioned to County.
Working with DISD to efile truancy cases.
PROJECT NAME: Network Infrastructure Upgrade

RESPONSIBLE DEPT: Commissioners Court

PROJECT MANAGER: John Hennessey

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Upgrade the network to provide improved performance for imaging and the new civil/JP courts system

BRIEFING DATE: 05/27/03

COURT ORDER: 2003-974

PROJECT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$864,462</td>
<td>$700,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original DATE</th>
<th>Current DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/27/03</td>
<td>08/15/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEDULING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS

Equipment orders placed. Working with Schlumberger on the implementation services for this project. Equipment ordered and is being received. Revised estimate from SLB has been received and reviewed by the IT Steering Committee. It will be briefed to Court in November.
## Major Technology Review

**PROJECT NAME**
Upgrade Sheriff's Imaging System

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**
Commissioners Court

**PROJECT MANAGER**
Rodney Christian

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
Add additional hardware storage capacity

**BRIEFING DATE**
04/01/03 Equipment

**PROJECT COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th><strong>DATE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$382,000</td>
<td>04/01/03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**USE OF FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**
Network cabling and power drops installed. Storage and 2 scanners ordered. Both scanners received and installed. Additional storage ordered and received. Working with Dell to complete the installation.
## Major Technology Review

### PROJECT NAME
Manage LLEBG Funds

### RESPONSIBLE DEPT
Commissioners Court

### PROJECT MANAGER
John Hennessey

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Manage the expenditure of LLEBG funds

### BRIEFING DATE
11/03/03

### COURT ORDER

### PROJECT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>10/09/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>10/09/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>10/09/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHEDULING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS

Summary for FY01 Funds:
- Total Amount available: $1,475,917
- Expenditures: $1,475,917

Summary for FY02 Funds:
- Total Amount available: $1,198,080
- Committed Projects: $364,088
- Available funds: $833,992

Summary for FY03 Funds:
- Total Amount Available: $1,002,057
- Committed Projects: $190,000
- Available Funds: $812,057

FY02 and FY03 Available: $1,646,049

Potential Projects for FY02 and FY03 funding:
- Laboratory Software - Forensics: $370,000
- CourtNotify Software: $395,000
- Radio Channel - Sheriff: $380,748
- Total Proposed Projects: $1,145,748
- Balance for new projects: $500,301
**PROJECT NAME**
Security

**RESPONSIBLE DEPT**
IT Services

**PROJECT MANAGER**
Vanessa King

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
Insure County network, servers and computers are properly secured from viruses, worms, hackers, etc.

**BRIEFING DATE**

**COURT ORDER**

**PROJECT COST**
Original Estimate
Modified

**SCHEDULING**
Start
Completion

**USE OF FUNDS**
Hardware
Software
Services

**PLANNED**

**CURRENT**

**DATE**

**ORIGINAL**

**CURRENT**

**VARIANCE**

**COMMENTS**
All servers have been upgraded with the latest security software patches. All firewalls have been upgraded with the latest security software patches. The antivirus software is maintained at the most current level provided by the vendor.

Working with the County's Office of Security and Emergency Management to evaluate security recommendations received from the Federal Homeland Security department.

Working with OSEM to obtain grant funding for IT security activities.
November 4, 2003

MISCELLANEOUS

1) **DISTRICT COURT ADMINISTRATION** - requests approval for the use of courtrooms and jury rooms (44th, 68th, 95th, and 191st District Court) located in the George L. Allen Building by SMU Dedman School of Law to conduct a Mock Trial Competition on Saturday, November 22, 2003 from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.

2) **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT** - requests approval:

   a) for the use of Commissioners Court by the Sixth Floor Museum for a symposium on Friday, November 21, 2003 and Saturday, November 22, 2003 from 8:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. Facilities Management will prepare the necessary Building User Permit with the appropriate fees applied. Dallas County Security will provide one Security Officer for the event.

   b) for Schlumberger located on the 5th floor of the Records Building, County Fire Station located at 1937 S. Beltline Road, and Child Support located on the 1st floor of George L. Allen Sr., Courts Building be furnished a vending machine by the present County vendor to be placed in their non-public area for the benefit of their employees only. This request complies with County policy and is recommended by Facilities Management.

   c) for the use and minor alterations to rooms 6107 and 653 on the sixth floor of the George L. Allen Sr., Courts Building. The space will be used to accommodate four attorneys that handle family court cases. The District Courts Administrator indicates that the Family District Court Judges have no problems with this request and endorses the Public Defenders presence in the building. The estimated cost associated with this request is $875 for carpet and $750 for minor modifications in room 6107 (mini bench removal) and can be funded from FY 2004 Permanent Improvement Fund (renovations) and the Public Defenders DDA Fund (carpet). Recommended by Facilities Management.
3) **SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT** - is notifying Commissioners Court of their intent to use drug forfeiture funds to purchase the following items:

- Six Dell Computers
- One Dell Notebook
- One HP Digital Color Copier/Printer
- One HP Deskjet Mobile Printer
- One HP Scanjet Digital Scanner
- One Lexar Card Reader

The total cost for the equipment is $10,000. The Sheriff’s Office has been awarded a $10,000 reimbursement anti-terrorism grant to purchase computers from the U.S. Department of Justice. The Sheriff’s Office would like Commissioners Court approval to use their drug forfeiture funds to purchase these computers, with reimbursement upon receipt of the grant. The Sheriff’s Office will submit a detailed plan for FY2004 expenditures at a later date (informational item).

4) **COUNTY CLERK** - requests approval to remodel space located on the 2nd floor of the Records Building. This remodeling will include the conversion of space into an office, a conference room and a receptionist area. In addition, the remodeling will provide additional space for the public viewing of documents. Facilities Management estimates the cost of the remodeling to be $6,260 with funding available from the Permanent Improvement Fund, Minor Building Renovations. Recommended by the Office of Budget & Evaluation.

**TRAVEL REQUESTS**

5) **SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT** - requests approval for Captain J. Ledford, Lt. J. Stambaugh, Sgt. P. Dotsie, and Sgt. P. Nelson to attend the 34th Annual Jail Management Conference in Huntsville, Texas on December 2-5, 2003 in a County vehicle with gas credit cards and no other cost to Dallas County.

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

a) Anita Friedman, Karine Lancaster, David Buhner, and Assefa Tulu to attend the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Summit in Austin, Texas on November 18-19, 2003: $1,092 is available in Grant Fund, OPHP Bioterrorism Department, Conference Training Account, FY Budget 2004, (00466.08723.02460.2004).

**EXCEPTION TO TRAVEL REQUESTS**

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

b) Jamie Fitchko to attend the Speaker at Symposium on Homeownership for Persons with Disabilities in Washington, D.C. on November 4-5, 2003 **at no cost to Dallas County**.

8) **SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT** - requests approval for David Guerra to attend Training in Waco, Texas on November 2-7, 2003 **at no cost to Dallas County**.

**MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT**

| DEPARTMENT: | 3210 Constable Evans, Constable Precinct 1 |
| ITEMS: | 1 - Desk with Return |
| ESTIMATED COST: | $101 |
| FUNDING SOURCE: | Reserves and Contingency, Furniture and Equipment 0120.3210.02090.2004 (General Fund, Constable Precinct 1, Property Less Than $5,000, FY2004) |
| EXPENDITURE SOURCE: | |
| PROPOSED ACTION: | Constable Evans, Constable Precinct 1, has requested a desk with a return for the new clerical position they earned based on the Constable Staffing Formula. The desk with a return is necessary for the Clerk to do their work because they must be able to sort through a substantial amount of paperwork in order to perform their job. As part of the FY2004 approved budget, Constable Precinct 1 was approved one desk without a return. The Constable has requested additional funding to purchase a desk with a return. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation. |
| DEPARTMENT: | 3220 | Constable Gothard, Constable Precinct 2 |
| ITEMS: | | |
| Vehicle Markings | ($300) |
| Rear Window Light Bar | ($335) |
| Windshield LED Light | ($140) |
| Strobe Bumper lights | ($300) |
| Strobe Light (Rear Window) | ($185) |
| Strobe Power Supplies | ($240) |
| Strobe Cables | ($180) |
| 12-Volt Power Receptacle | ($13) |
| Push Bumper | ($100) |
| Siren | ($330) |
| Console | ($300) |
| Switch Panel | ($120) |
| Flashers | ($80) |
| Siren Speakers | ($240) |
| Cage | ($335) |
| Flashlight | ($95) |
| In-Car Video Camera | ($3,300) |
| Radar with Two Antennas | ($3,500) |
| Radio | ($600) |
| Computer Equipment & Software | ($12,000) |
| ESTIMATED COST: | $22,693 |
| FUNDING SOURCE: | Reserves and Contingency |
| EXPENDITURE SOURCE: | 0120.3220.02090.2004 (General Fund, Constable Precinct 2, Property Less Than $5,000, FY2004) |
| | 0120.3220.02097.2004 (General Fund, Constable Precinct 2, Radios Less Than $5,000, FY2004) |
| | 0120.3220.08630.2004 (General Fund, Constable Precinct 2, Computer Hardware, FY2004) |
| PROPOSED ACTION: | Constable Gothard, Constable Precinct 2, has requested replacement equipment that was destroyed in a vehicle fire. The equipment that was lost in the vehicle fire was used in the traffic enforcement program. Without this equipment, the Traffic Deputy will not be able to perform their duties. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation. |

| DEPARTMENT: | 5115 | Juvenile Department – Hill Center |
| ITEMS: | | |
| 1 – Sedan | |
| ESTIMATED COST: | $0 (Surplus Vehicle) |
| | $400 – Safety modifications |
| FUNDING SOURCE: | Reserves and Contingency, Furniture and Equipment |
EXPENDITURE SOURCES: 00120.5115.02090.2004 (General Fund, Hill Center, Property Less than $5,000, FY2004)

PROPOSED ACTION: The Juvenile Department is requesting the assignment of a surplus vehicle to the Hill Center for non-emergency medical transports. The department has been utilizing a surplus vehicle, however the vehicle is now non-operational. The Automotive Service Center has identified a used sedan. This vehicle currently has rear door safety lock switches. The vehicle does need to have protective caging installed at an estimated cost of $400. Recommended by the Office of Budget and Evaluation and the Automotive Service Center.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REQUEST

Telecommunications M-0410051 requests to install a SebII modem to notify dispatch when GACB PBX has switched to battery back up. Equipment: $1500.00; Installation: $75.00; labor provided by contract; monthly service increase: 39.00. Recommended.

Health & Human Services - requests:
M-0309057 to exchange locations of extensions 8021 and 2729. Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

M-0310027 to upgrade a existing single-line phone to a multi-line phone to help provide better efficiency. Equipment: $38.00; Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Sheriff Inmate Programs M-0310003 requests to relocate extension 2664 to room ST-6-1 on the 7th floor of the west tower. Installation: $99.00; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Human Resources M-0310030 requests to relocate extensions 7608 and 6052 to rooms 101 and 103 on the 1st floor of the Records building. Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.
Auditors M-0310015 requests to install a new single-line phone on the 4th floor of the Records building for employee to use. Equipment: $40.32; Installation: $41.50; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Bio-Terrorism - requests:
D-0310013 to install a data-line cable on the 5th floor in room 500 to connect plotter to the network. Installation: $58.75; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

D-0410013 thru D-0410017 to install several data-line cables on the 5th floor room 532 to provide access to the TACHO network. Installation: $831.25; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

OSEM —0410046 requests to install a single-line in room 305 on the 3rd floor of the Records building to be used with a modem. Installation: $41.50; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

256th Criminal District Court M-0310038 requests to add an extension line appearance to a multi-line phone in the Judges chambers. Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Juvenile M-0310034 requests to remove the phone system from 10325 Lake June Road due to the closing of Project Spotlight. Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

Tax Office M-0310037 requests to reprogram extensions 4605 & 4606 to answer all incoming calls due to needs of the department. Installation: $0.00; labor provided by contract; no monthly service increase. Recommended.

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