

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY OF PLAN AMENDMENT

DATE: April 12, 2001

The following amendment to the FY2000 Strategic Plan is submitted to the Commission for consideration and approval:

1. A request to increase the FY 2000 Strategic Plan, Level III, Recorder component by \$19,695 for the replacement of the recorder at Frio and Kendall Counties.

Falls within established guidelines: ___yes X no ___ n/a

Action: denied / approved

Financial Impact:

An increase to the FY2000 Strategic Plan Level III, Recorders component by \$6,980 and a decrease to the FY2000 Level III Emergency Power component by \$6,980 will not increase the overall budget.

Comments: In August 2000, the Alamo Area Council of Governments (AACOG) reimbursed Frio County and Kendall County which have two position PSAPS \$17,712 for a 12-Channel Recorder and \$14,999.50 for a 16-Channel Recorder. Staff visited AACOG regarding this issue. Included is the report documenting that visit. In accordance with Rule 251.6, a two position PSAP is eligible for a four-channel recorder up to a maximum of \$10,000. A total of \$12,711.50 was paid beyond the maximum of \$20,000. Documentation received subsequent to the purchase did not provide justification for funding beyond \$10,000 for each recorder. In addition, no recorder worksheets were submitted to CSEC prior to the purchase of the recorders as required

by 251.6. Capital Recovery funds of \$6,000 for Frio County and \$7,020 for Kendall County have already been used. Staff recommends additional funding of \$4,000 for Frio County and \$2,980 for Kendall County, providing up to the \$10,000 maximum amount for each recorder. Since the COG has already reimbursed the counties for the full amount, staff recommends that AACOG reimburse the 9-1-1 fund in the amount of \$12,711.50

March 8, 2001

Al J. Notzon III, Executive Director
Alamo Area Council of Governments
8700 Tesoro Drive, Suite 700
San Antonio, TX 78217

Dear Mr. Notzon:

In December of 2000, the Alamo Area Council of Governments (AACOG) submitted an amendment to the Commission on State Emergency Communications (CSEC) requesting reimbursement of funds associated with the purchase of recording equipment for Frio and Kendall Counties. Due to excessive costs associated with the purchases, a member of CSEC's Compliance staff and the Systems Analyst assigned to AACOG visited AACOG to research documentation necessary to ensure compliance with CSEC rules. Enclosed is the amended report that describes the findings discovered during the review.

During the review, documentation was found to be incomplete. On March 7, 2001, CSEC received and reviewed the aforementioned documentation for evidence substantiating the excessive costs. As a result of the supplemental review, staff concurs that the request continues to be out of compliance with Rule 251.6, and therefore does not recommend approval of the amendment.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call at any time.

Sincerely,

Kelli Merriweather
Compliance Program Administrator

enclosures

cc: Dean Danos, AACOG Deputy Director
Nolan Suarez, AACOG 9-1-1 Coordinator
Carey Spence, CSEC Interim Executive Director

**AACOG Recorder Documentation Visit
February 14-15, 2000
(Report Amended March 8, 2001)**

Background:

Prior to our visit, Compliance Staff was notified that AACOG submitted an amendment requesting funds to reimburse Frio and Kendall Counties for recorder purchases made in June of 2000. Recorder replacements were not in the Council of Government's strategic plan for FY 2000. Additionally, the counties spent more than the allowable expenses for recorders.

Discussions with the Council's 9-1-1 Coordinator gave more insight into the reasoning for the recorder purchases. The coordinator stated that the previous recorders in Frio and Kendall counties were purchased in 1997 with three to five (3-5) year recovery periods. The coordinator stated that the recorders broke down and when the counties contacted the vendor about repair parts, the vendor stated that due to the age of the recorders, spare parts were not available and the warranty was expired for the 1997 purchases. Additionally, Commercial Electronics was no longer able to offer maintenance contracts on the Racal recorders due to the unavailability of parts; a letter detailing this information was provided to AACOG on February 12, 2001.

Frio County:

The county replaced the recorder because they stated it wasn't working. The printer element was distorted and the playback wouldn't work. The county stated (in a letter signed by the Frio County Coordinator) that they wanted to cost-share the recorder. The County replaced the recorders in June, shortly after they broke down. Although it wasn't an anticipated replacement, political turmoil in the county prevented adequate communication between the county 9-1-1 coordinator and the COG 9-1-1 coordinator. The COG did provide the county with a list of vendors. The county was to follow its own bid process. Copies of those bids were provided to AACOG and copies were requested by compliance staff on 2/14/01. AACOG would get the information and submit to CSEC by March 2, 2001.

The county increased the number of channels necessary on the new recorders based on their anticipated need. Additionally, the COG coordinator stated that NAFTA increased traffic in the county, resulting in an increase in EMS and law enforcement calls. CSEC requested proof of additional call volume; AACOG's 9-1-1 Coordinator would get this information to CSEC by March 2, 2001.

Due to the age of the RACAL recorder, RACAL was not interested in taking the outdated recorder, so the sheriff's office requested it be housed at the S.O. in the event that it had to be utilized for the pending criminal investigation of the sheriff of Frio County.

CSEC staff advised the COG 9-1-1 coordinator that a letter from the vendor should be written explaining that they agreed to do this and for what length of time.

Kendall County:

The county stated that their county cost contribution was the trade-in allowance from the vendor because they were able to get that after negotiating with the vendor. Their justification was that, had they not negotiated with the vendor, the vendor would not have given them an allowance due to the age of the recorder and it's uselessness to the vendor.

CSEC staff advised the COG 9-1-1 Coordinator that this practice is not acceptable as a means of utilizing the cost-share system. Staff informed the coordinator that the county should be paying (out of their own budget) a portion of the final cost of the recorder, not utilize the negotiated discount as their cost-share. AACOG's 9-1-1 Coordinator stated that the counties felt strongly that this should be considered their cost share because they had to negotiate to get the allowance.

CSEC staff advised the coordinator that CSEC does not agree with this justification but that the final decision would be made by the Commission at the next meeting in April. CSEC staff advised the coordinator to get a letter from the vendor stating that a discount would not have been given had the counties not negotiated for it, and a letter from the county to justify this reasoning.

Additional Monitoring Activities:

While CSEC staff was visiting with AACOG, staff took the opportunity to audit the COG's financial reporting and reconcile the financial status reports to the invoices/receipts submitted for payment for each quarter in fiscal year 2000 and the first quarter of fiscal year 2001.

Staff found no items that were out of the ordinary or missing receipts/invoices. A discrepancy was found in the COG's 4th quarter ledger, but discussed the issue with the COG's financial staff and determined that adjustments were made at the end of the fiscal year that were not reflected in the COG's ledger but were reflected on the Financial Status Report for the 4th quarter of FY 2000.

Overview:

Frio County Recorder Issues:

Check made out to the County from AACOG on 8/17/00 for \$17,712	
Capital Recovery Used:	\$6,000
9-1-1 Funds Used:	<u>\$11,712</u>
Total:	\$17,712

12-Channel Recorder purchased for 2 position PSAP.

Proposed Amendment on December 22, 2000 to move funds from Level III Emergency Power in the amount of \$20,000 to Recorders to cover the costs of recorders for the COG.

- No Recorder Worksheets submitted to CSEC prior to the purchase of the recorders.
- No proper justification for the increase in channels on the new recorders. Justification requested from COG and County by March 2, 2001.
- County did not really “cost-share” in the cost of the recorders. Trade-in allowance is not the same as “cost-share”. CSEC requested justification letter from county for cost-share with a suspense date of March 2, 2001.
- Why did the county purchase the recorder if the COG had purchased one in FY 1997 for the county and had no plans to replace it until 2002. County needs to clarify this in written document to CSEC by March 2, 2001.
- CSEC requested copies of bids for the recorders from AACOG’s 9-1-1 coordinator. COG to provide bid copies to CSEC by March 2, 2001.
- Vendor needs to write a letter to the COG and cc CSEC regarding agreement to house old recorder at the Sheriff’s office for the one year period in the event it is needed during criminal investigations. Due by March 2, 2001.

Kendall County Recorder Issues:

Check made out to the county from AACOG on 8/24/00 for \$14,995.50

Capital Recovery Used:	\$7,020
9-1-1 Funds Used:	<u>\$7,979.50</u>
Total:	\$14,995.50

16-Channel Recorder purchased for 2 position PSAP.

- No Recorder Worksheets submitted to CSEC prior to the purchase of the recorders.
- No justification for the 16 channels instead of 4 or 10 (State Cap). County to provide letter of justification for additional channels by March 2, 2001.
- Clarification on letter from the county regarding reason for the purchase (i.e. maintenance not available due to outdated parts, recorder stopped working, etc.). Due by March 2, 2001.
- County needs to provide justification for using trade-in allowance as their “cost-share”. Due by March 2, 2001.

Amended Staff Recommendations

On March 7, 2001, CSEC staff received the documentation requested from AACOG during the initial visit. The documentation includes letters from the Boerne Police Department in Kendall County and Commercial Electronics Corp. for the purchase of the RACAL recorder as well as call volume increases for Kendall County. Documentation for Frio County includes a letter from the Frio County 9-1-1 Coordinator, a letter from Dictaphone regarding the trade-in allowance and a summary report from another Frio County 9-1-1 Coordinator. The following represents the recommendations of CSEC staff.

Rule 251.6(f)(i) states that CSEC will award funding, when justified, for the actual costs of basic recording systems not to exceed \$10,000 on 4-channel or equivalent systems, and not to exceed \$20,000 on up to 10-channel or equivalent recording systems. Requests for any other recording systems will require separate approval by the Commission.

After reviewing the documentation provided by AACOG as well as Kendall and Frio Counties, CSEC staff has determined that the documentation does not justify the purchase of recorders with channels exceeding the allowance by CSEC rules. Although call volume has increased in each county, the two-position PSAPs in each county only require the need for a 4-channel recorder in Frio County and up to 8 channels in Kendall County. Therefore, CSEC will only fund up to \$10,000 for the purchase of recording equipment in each county. Any additional costs will have to be absorbed by the Alamo Area Council of Governments or the counties involved in the purchases. Additionally, CSEC staff notes that proper procedures were not followed prior to the purchase of the recorders and submission of amendment request. Any future purchases of recorders will have to be approved by CSEC prior to purchase.

Finally, CSEC does not agree with Frio and Kendall Counties' argument to use trade-in allowances provided by the vendor as the counties' cost share for the recorders.

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

Alamo Area Council of Governments

December 6, 2000

Mr. James D. Goerke
Executive Director
Commission on State
Emergency Communications
333 Guadalupe Street, Suite 2-212
Austin, Texas 78701

RE: Plan Notification Amendment for
AACOG FY 2000 Budget

Dear Mr. Goerke:

The Alamo Area Council of Governments submits the attached Plan Notification Amendment to our FY 2000 Budget for your consideration.

This plan amendment is submitted for three reasons: First, to reflect an increase in our FY 2000 fringe rate. Second, to reduce amounts in the Capital Recovery Component in Level 11, and finally to transfer Level I and Level III Component Funds to other components in Level III. A detailed explanation for this amendment is reflected on the attached plan amendment forms.

A copy of the cost allocation plan from our cognizant agency is enclosed to substantiate the approved fringe rate.

The amended budget is depicted on the attached forms. It was coordinated with Norma Valle, our Systems Analyst.

Please contact me should you have questions.

Regional yours,

Al J. O III
Executive Director

NRS:clk

Attachments

cc: Blanca Tapia, Controller

CAPITAL AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY OF PLAN AMENDMENT

DATE: April 12, 2001

The following amendment to the Strategic Plan is submitted to the Commission for consideration and approval.

1. A request to increase the FY 2001 Strategic Plan, Level III Other component by \$500,000 to procure a contract to update and replace the existing black and white digital aerial photography for the entire 10 county region.

Falls within established guidelines: ___yes X_no ___n/a

Action: denied/approved

Financial Impact: CAPCO proposes utilizing \$500,000 of wireless service fee balance to fund this project.

Comments: In 1997 CAPCO completed a regional aerial photography project in anticipation of Mapped ALI. This data has now become outdated due to the high growth rate of the region. This new request would update and replace this outdated data and would allow CAPCO to be ready for Mapped ALI and Wireless Phase II. In addition, this request would facilitate and enhance the routing of Wireless Phase I, which is currently being implemented. CAPCO anticipates that this project would cost approximately \$2 million, with local governments funding the majority and CAPCO funding \$500,000. Once CAPCO issues a Request for Proposal, it is anticipated that the project would begin August 2001 and be completed by May 2002. Staff has performed an analysis of the wireless service fee balances and wireless obligations and projects that CAPCO will have the necessary funds to accommodate this request.

9-1-1 SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET

Regional Council	Capital Area Planning Council
------------------	-------------------------------

CSEC Commission Meeting

BUDGET COMPONENT	APPROVED STRATEGIC PLAN				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		24,781	24,670	20,164	\$89,779
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		2,614,862	3,367,388	2,756,492	\$11,565,234
Level IIa: Addressing		248,752	0	0	\$248,752
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		985,769	1,123,955	1,084,239	\$4,278,202
Level III: Other Costs		113,988	1,441,816	1,735,022	\$3,987,019
Operating Costs		2,220,329	990,215	969,021	\$5,249,521
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$6,208,481	\$6,948,044	\$6,564,938	\$25,418,507
Prior Year Fund Balance		8,425	1,586	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		4,835,442	4,835,442	4,835,442	\$19,341,768
Wireless Fee Revenue		403,200	1,344,000	1,344,000	\$4,435,200
Addressing Pool Funds		125,000	12,500	14,000	\$168,000
Local Match		838,000	(350,000)	(488,000)	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$6,210,067	\$5,843,528	\$5,705,442	\$23,944,968
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$1,104,516	\$859,496	\$1,964,012
SURCHARGE ALLOCATED					\$0
COG FUND BALANCE	\$8,425	\$1,586	\$0	\$0	

* Totals include an originally budgeted FY2002 amount.

Page 31

BUDGET COMPONENT	Proposed Strategic Plan				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		24,781	24,670	20,164	\$89,779
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		2,614,862	3,367,388	2,756,492	\$11,565,234
Level IIa: Addressing		248,752	0	0	\$248,752
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		985,769	1,123,955	1,084,239	\$4,278,202
Level III: Other Costs		113,988	1,441,816	2,235,022	\$4,487,019
Operating Costs		2,220,329	990,215	969,021	\$5,249,521
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$6,208,481	\$6,948,044	\$7,064,938	\$25,918,507
Prior Year Fund Balance		8,425	1,586	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		4,835,442	4,835,442	4,835,442	\$19,341,768
Wireless Fee Revenue		403,200	1,344,000	1,344,000	\$4,435,200
Monitoring Repayment		125,000	12,500	14,000	\$168,000
Wireless Reserve		838,000	(350,000)	(488,000)	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$6,210,067	\$5,843,528	\$5,705,442	\$23,944,968
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$1,104,516	\$1,359,496	\$2,464,012
SURCHARGE ALLOCATION		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
COG FUND BALANCE	\$8,425	\$1,586	\$0	\$0	

April 12, 2001

Regional Council	Capital Area Planning Council
------------------	-------------------------------

BUDGET COMPONENT	Net Changes Proposed				TOTALS
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level II: SR/ALI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level IIa: Addressing	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level III: Other Costs	0	0	0	500,000	\$500,000
Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	0	0	0	500,000	\$500,000
Prior Year Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	\$0
Wireline Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0
Wireless Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0
Addressing Pool & Match	0	0	0	0	\$0
Other	0	0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	\$0
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST	0	0	0	500,000	\$500,000
PROPOSED SURCHARGE	0	0	0	0	\$0
COG FUND BALANCE	0	0	0	0	\$0

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

Capital Area Planning Council 2512 IH 35 South, Suite 220

Austin, Texas 78704

512.443.7653 (fax) 512.443.7658

March 7, 2001

Ms. Carey Spence
Acting Executive Director
Commission on State Emergency Communications
333 Guadalupe Street Suite 2-212
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

Re: FY 01 Plan Amendment

Dear Carey:

Enclosed please find a Plan Amendment for the FY 01 CAPCO Strategic Plan. The amendment requests use of projected service fee revenue currently not budgeted within the CAPCO Region to allow CAPCO to procure a contract to update/replace the existing black and white digital orthophotography currently used in the 9-1-1 Addressing operations. The monies would be distributed within appropriate line items of each county in the Strategic Plan.

This project will allow CAPCO to move forward faster to implement Mapped ALI and thus be ready for Phase 11 Wireless activities. As you are aware, three years ago, CAPCO was prepared to begin implementing Mapped ALI at each of our PSAPs when CSEC requested that we postpone implementation of the program. We had undertaken a regional aerial photography project in 1997 in anticipation of Mapped ALI implementation and, while that photography has been invaluable to us in addressing and implementing Phase I wireless, it is becoming outdated, due to the extremely high growth rate of our MSA. The 1997 project will provide an important foundation so that the update we are now proposing can be done for substantially less cost. We are also able to take advantage of other regional partners sharing the cost of this update since some of our cities and counties are at a critical point in needing updated photography.

You acknowledged the importance of up-to-date accurate GIS and aerial photography data within the 9-1-1 venue during a CAPCO 9-1-1 Task Force a few months back, so we are hopeful CSEC staff will be comfortable recommending a plan amendment for this project during the next CSEC meeting in April 2001.

We are requesting \$500,000 for this project that will be used in conjunction with other funds provided by local governments within the CAPCO Region. This participation will offset the cost to the 9-1-1 Program considerably. Projections indicated our FY2001 revenue will exceed Strategic Plan estimates by about \$1,600,000 and we had unexpended wireless revenues of \$1,874,754 at the close of FY2000; either of these sources are available to fund this request.

Ms. Carey Spence
FY01 Plan Amendment
Page 2

The CAPCO Executive Committee has reviewed this request and they have authorized me to make this request of the CSEC to increase the overall CAPCO FY 01 Strategic Plan.

As always, please contact me if you have questions or need more information.

Sincerely,
Betty Voights
Executive Director

Enclosure

cc: Jesse Harrison

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

Capital Area Planning Council 2512 IH 35 South, Suite 220

Austin, Texas 78704

512.443.7653 (fax) 512.443.7658

March 28, 2001

Carey Spence

Interim Executive Director

Commission on State Emergency Communications

333 Guadalupe Street, Suite 2-212

Austin, Texas 78701-3942

Dear Ms. Spence:

Please accept this memo as additional clarification regarding the Strategic Plan Amendment for the GIS Aerial Photography project submitted by CAPCO for the next Commission meeting agenda.

As you are aware, CAPCO, along with the entire state of Texas, is attempting to implement Wireless Phase I technology in each PSAP; with the ultimate goal of moving to Wireless Phase II in the very near future. The aforementioned project will allow for more accurate routing schemes for wireless callers calling 9-1-1. It is vital to the overall success of the Wireless Phase I and II projects that the most accurate data be available for use *when* routing these types of calls.

I hope this information is of use to you and your staff in making your recommendation to the Commission on State Emergency Communications. Should you need any further information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Betty Voights

CAPCO Executive Director

LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY OF PLAN AMENDMENT

DATE: April 12, 2000

The following amendment to the FY2001 Strategic Plan is submitted to the Commission for consideration and approval:

1. A request to increase the FY2001 Administrative Budget by 2 FTEs for addressing maintenance activities.

Falls within established guidelines: yes no n/a

Action: denied / approved

Financial Impact:

A reduction of the FY2001 Strategic Plan Level III, Other component by \$47,679 and an increase to the FY2001 Administrative Budget - Personnel, Fringe Benefit, and Indirect Cost components by \$47,679 will not increase the overall budget. The COG wishes to utilize unexpended wireless funds to pay for these expenditures.

Comments: LRGVDC is requesting an increase to their administrative budget to hire two Addressing Technicians for addressing maintenance for only the next 5 months – the remaining duration of the FY2001 Strategic Plan. It has been a challenge for their current staff of one GIS Analyst and one Addressing Technician to keep up with the region's population growth rate of 33.3%. The COG performs addressing maintenance activities region-wide. Their rate of growth is second only to Laredo (38.8%), yet ahead of the Austin-San Marcos area (25.8%). In addition, it is the second largest Metropolitan Area in the State 9-1-1 Program.

Staff review of LRGVDC's Amendment and worksheet shows that there will be an estimated balance of \$376,447 in their Wireless Budget – Level III, Other at the end of FY2001.

Currently, there is a Commission Policy that allows for the transfer of 30% of wireless funds for landline expenditures. Staff recommends this temporary funding for the present fiscal year on the condition that this does not carry over to the COG's administrative budget for the next fiscal year.

ACTION SHEET
9-1-1 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET SUMMARY

Regional Council Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council

Budget Year: FY 2001 (September, 2000 through August, 2001)

Category

	FY 01 Approved Amount	FY 01 Proposed Amount	Difference
PERSONNEL (A)	\$125,584	\$149,097	\$23,513
FRINGE BENEFITS (B)	52,330	62,129	9,799
TRAVEL (C)	34,464	34,464	0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES (D)	6,000	6,000	0
SUPPLIES (E)	9,000	9,000	0
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES (F)	1,000	1,000	0
OTHER (G)	<u>141,905</u>	<u>141,905</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (H)	\$370,283	\$403,595	\$33,312
INDIRECT COSTS (I)	<u>76,735</u>	<u>91,102</u>	<u>14,367</u>
TOTAL COSTS (J)	<u><u>\$447,018</u></u>	<u><u>\$494,697</u></u>	<u><u>\$47,679</u></u>

The FY 2001 Administrative Budget is submitted to the Commission for approval:

- _____ approved
- _____ approved with changes
- _____ not approved

Comments: FY 01 Approved - FTE 6.55, Fringe Rate 41.67%, Indirect Rate 43.13%

FY 01 Proposed - FTE 8.55, Fringe Rate 41.67%, Indirect Rate 43.13%

Below 10% allowable Indirect Rate provision.

Admin01

04/02/01

9-1-1 SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET

Proposed Amendment

Regional Council Lower Rio Grande Valley DC

CSEC Commission Meeting

BUDGET COMPONENT	Current Strategic Plan				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		31,440	31,160	31,160	\$124,920
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		905,188	918,152	925,489	\$3,689,306
Level IIa: Addressing		168,187	86,000	0	\$254,187
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		0	0	0	\$0
Level III: Other Costs		411,131	584,534	703,519	\$1,947,824
Operating Costs		366,238	414,266	447,018	\$1,687,950
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$1,882,184	\$2,034,112	\$2,107,186	\$7,704,187
Prior Year Fund Balance		718,920	93,209	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		1,048,900	1,048,900	1,048,900	\$4,195,600
Wireless Fee Revenue		165,114	550,380	550,380	\$1,816,254
Addressing Pool Funds		42,459	0	0	\$42,459
Local Match		0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$1,975,393	\$1,692,489	\$1,599,280	\$6,054,313
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$341,623	\$507,906	\$865,275
SURCHARGE ALLOCATED		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,141
COG FUND BALANCE	\$718,920	\$93,209	\$0	\$0	

* Totals include an originally budgeted FY2002 amount.

Page 39

BUDGET COMPONENT	Proposed Plan Amendment				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		31,440	31,160	31,160	\$124,920
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		905,188	918,152	925,489	\$3,689,306
Level IIa: Addressing		168,187	86,000	0	\$254,187
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		0	0	0	\$0
Level III: Other Costs		411,131	584,534	655,840	\$1,900,145
Operating Costs		366,238	414,266	494,697	\$1,675,399
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$1,882,184	\$2,034,112	\$2,107,186	\$7,643,957
Prior Year Fund Balance		718,920	93,209	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		1,048,900	1,048,900	1,048,900	\$4,195,600
Wireless Fee Revenue		165,114	550,380	550,380	\$1,816,254
Addressing Pool & Match		42,459	0	0	\$42,459
Other		0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$1,975,393	\$1,692,489	\$1,599,280	\$6,054,313
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$341,623	\$507,906	\$870,724
SURCHARGE ALLOCATION		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,141
COG FUND BALANCE	\$718,920	\$93,209	\$0	\$0	

April 12, 2001

		Regional Council				Lower Rio Grande Valley DC			
BUDGET COMPONENT	Net Changes Proposed				TOTALS				
	1998	1999	2000	2001					
Level I: ANI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Level II: SR/ALI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Level IIa: Addressing	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Level III: Other Costs	0	0	0	(47,679)	(\$47,679)				
Operating Costs	0	0	0	47,679	(\$12,551)				
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	0	0	0	0	(\$60,230)				
Prior Year Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Wireline Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Wireless Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Addressing Pool & Match	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Other	0	0	0	0	\$0				
TOTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	\$0				
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST	0	0	0	0	\$5,449				
PROPOSED SURCHARGE	0	0	0	0	\$0				
COG FUND BALANCE	0	0	0	0	\$0				

TEXOMA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY OF PLAN AMENDMENT

DATE: April 12, 2001

The following amendment to the FY 2001 Strategic Plan is submitted to the Commission for consideration and approval:

1. A request to increase the FY 2001 Strategic Plan, Level III, Recorder component by \$15,400 for the replacement of the recorder at the Gainesville Police Department.

Falls within established guidelines: ___ yes X no ___ n/a

Action: denied / approved

Financial Impact: Increase in the FY 2001 budget authority of \$3,419 to the Level III, Recorders component. This request will be accommodated by current service fee revenue.

Comments: Texoma is requesting \$15,400 to purchase an eight-channel recorder for the Gainesville Police Department. However, in accordance with Rule 251.6, a two position PSAP is eligible for a four-channel recorder up to a maximum of \$10,000. Additionally, Texoma Council of Governments has set aside Capital Recovery funds for replacement of the Gainesville recorder in the amount of \$6,581. Texoma is requesting \$15,400 for the recorder; however, staff recommends \$3,419. This amount, in addition to the \$6,581 already set aside, would allow TEXOMA to fund the recorder at \$10,000. Staff recommends approval as noted above.

9-1-1 SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET

Regional Council	Texoma COG
------------------	------------

BUDGET COMPONENT	Approved Strategic Plan				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		2,850	2,350	2,350	\$9,900
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		112,363	233,145	239,346	\$801,319
Level IIa: Addressing		40,000	0	0	\$40,000
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		60,000	60,000	60,000	\$240,000
Level III: Other Costs		52,000	120,025	120,807	\$353,387
Operating Costs		112,950	131,307	136,698	\$504,378
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$380,163	\$546,827	\$559,201	\$1,948,984
Prior Year Fund Balance		138,360	99,835	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		297,699	297,699	297,699	\$1,190,796
Wireless Fee Revenue		33,939	113,130	113,130	\$373,329
Addressing Pool Funds		10,000	0	0	\$10,000
Local Match		0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$479,998	\$510,664	\$410,829	\$1,574,125
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$36,163	\$148,372	\$236,499
SURCHARGE ALLOCATED		\$0	(\$0)	\$28,489	\$47,422
COG FUND BALANCE	\$138,360	\$99,835	\$0	\$0	

* Totals include an originally budgeted FY2002 amount.

BUDGET COMPONENT	Proposed Strategic Plan				TOTALS *
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs		2,850	2,350	2,350	\$9,900
Level II: SR/ALI Costs		112,363	233,145	239,346	\$801,319
Level IIa: Addressing		40,000	0	0	\$40,000
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance		60,000	60,000	60,000	\$240,000
Level III: Other Costs		52,000	120,025	124,226	\$353,387
Operating Costs		112,950	131,307	136,698	\$504,378
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$380,163	\$546,827	\$562,620	\$1,948,984
Prior Year Fund Balance		138,360	99,835	0	-----
Wireline Fee Revenue		297,699	297,699	297,699	\$1,190,796
Wireless Fee Revenue		33,939	113,130	113,130	\$373,329
Addressing Pool & Match		10,000	0	0	\$10,000
Other		0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$479,998	\$510,664	\$410,829	\$1,574,125
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST		\$0	\$36,163	\$151,791	\$236,499
SURCHARGE ALLOCATION		\$0	(\$0)	\$28,489	\$47,422
COG FUND BALANCE	\$138,360	\$99,835	\$0	\$0	

Regional Council	Texoma COG
------------------	------------

BUDGET COMPONENT	Net Changes Proposed				TOTALS
	1998	1999	2000	2001	
Level I: ANI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level II: SR/ALI Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level IIa: Addressing	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level IIb: Addressing Maintenance	0	0	0	0	\$0
Level III: Other Costs	0	0	0	3,419	\$3,419
Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	0	0	0	3,419	\$3,419
Prior Year Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	\$0
Wireline Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0
Wireless Fee Revenue	0	0	0	0	\$0
Addressing Pool & Match	0	0	0	0	\$0
Other	0	0	0	0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	\$0
POTENTIAL SURCHARGE REQUEST	0	0	0	3,419	\$3,419
PROPOSED SURCHARGE	0	0	0	0	\$0
COG FUND BALANCE	0	0	0	0	\$0

HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL

ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY OF PLAN AMENDMENT

DATE: April 12, 2001

The following amendment to the Strategic Plan is submitted to the Commission for consideration and approval.

1. A request to establish the Bay City Police Department as a Primary Safety Answering Point (PSAP) in Matagorda County.

Falls within established guidelines: ___yes no ___n/a

Action: denied/approved

Financial Impact: Houston-Galveston Area Council (HGAC) proposed that the non-recurring amount of \$54,647 would be drawn from the existing capital recovery account. The annualized monthly-recurring cost for the network of \$3,980 would be drawn from the wireless component. Request would be accommodated within current approved budget. There is no impact on equalization surcharge.

Comments: Establishment of the Bay City Police Department as a primary PSAP was scheduled for FY 1998 contingent on the consolidation of the Walker County Sheriffs office and the Huntsville Police Department. Due to delays in the consolidation effort, the Bay City Police Department never received the equipment that was originally in the Huntsville Police Department. Subsequently, The State Auditors Office released "An Audit Report on the Statewide 911 System" in July 1998 that recommended the consolidation of the 911 administrative system, Public Safety Answering Points, and dispatch functions.

Additionally, the Sunset Commission recommended to the legislature that the Commission develop standards for the use of answering points and the creation of new answering points. This requirement is found in HB 1983, Contracts for Services, Section 771.078 © (4). As a result of the two reports, the Commission issued a moratorium in 1999 regarding the addition of 9-1-1 PSAPs and the addition of PSAP positions. With the current moratorium in place, and after review of call volume statistics provided, staff is not recommending approval of the additional PSAP. However, staff would support the establishment of a remote printer; so that the 9-1-1 calls transferred to the Bay City Police Department from the primary PSAP in Matagorda County would have the Automatic Location Information (ALI) readily available.

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

BAY CITY POLICE DEPT.
2201 AVENUE H
BAY CITY, TEXAS 77414

December 10, 2000

To: Vander E. Phelps, Public Safety Program Manager

From: Teresa Spradlen, PSAP Coordinator

Re: 911 PSAP Designation

I have been informed that the Commission on State Emergency Communications will be meeting in February 2001 to discuss several issues one of which includes allocating funds for this department to proceed with our long laid plans of establishing Bay City Police Department as a 911 PSAP.

This department has been operating under a 911 PSAP Secondary system in Matagorda County since the late 1980's. I would like to briefly outline for you some of the problems with this type of system that we have experienced for quite some time.

- Delay of emergency services for citizens due to one answering point.
- Calls transferred to incorrect emergency service agencies.
- Citizens disregard of dialing 911 due to transfer type 911 system. Citizens feel time is saved by calling Directly to the police department on non-emergency lines to avoid delay and duplicating information.
- Delayed reports from 911 PSAP of hangup calls received.
- Non-emergency calls transferred to emergency service agencies through 911 system (i.e , animal calls, Administrative calls, public works calls, etc ...)

Bay City is the largest city in Matagorda County. Most calls made using 911 come from citizens living within the city limits of Bay City. By designating our agency as a primary answering point for all calls originating within the city limits and providing our department with the necessary equipment to provide this service would eliminate all of the problems listed above and provide a more effective and efficient 911 system to the citizens of Bay City.

If you have any questions or would like more information please call me at (979) 245-8500. I would like to thank you in advance for your time and consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,

Teresa Spradlen

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

Houston-Galveston Area Council

P.O. Box 22777 • 3555 Timmons • Houston, Texas 77227-2777 • 713/627-3200

December 28, 2000

Norma Valle
CSEC Systems Analyst
333 Guadalupe, Suite 2-212
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

Dear Ms. Valle:

The Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) is submitting a Plan Amendment Request to establish the Bay City Police Department as a Primary PSAP. I have included the following justification for this request.

- Conversion of the Bay City Police Department to a PSAP was approved in the FY1998-FY2002 Strategic Plan
- Majority of the equipment has been paid for and is in storage awaiting installation
- Bay City is the largest city in Matagorda County - population over 18,500
- Over 50% of the county population resides in Bay City
- Currently all 9-1-1 calls are answered at the Matagorda County Sheriffs Office
- Calls originating within the city limits have to be transferred to the Police Department
- Last year approximately 30,000 calls were transferred to the Police Department
- Response times are delayed due to callers having to repeat information to two agencies; thus many city residents dial the direct telephone number to avoid being transferred
- Bay City Police Department receives no ANI/ALI information thus jeopardizing the safety of its officers
- Residents of Bay City are not receiving the full benefits of Enhanced 9-1-1 services

If you require any additional information please contact Karen Brown, 9-1-1 Projects Coordinator at 713.993.2486 or Vander Phelps, Public Safety Program Manager at 713.993.4543. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Vander Phelps

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

Houston-Galveston Area Council

P.O. Box 22777 • 3555 Timmons • Houston, Texas 77227-2777 • 713/627-3200

December 28, 2000

Noma Valle
CSEC Systems Analyst
333 Guadalupe, Suite 2-212
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

Dear Ms. Valle:

Please accept the attached Plan Amendment to the H-GAC 9-1-1 Strategic Plan for FY 2001. The amendment is to establish the Bay City Police Department as a Primary PSAP in Matagorda County.

In summary, the amendment will increase the Level II ANI/ALI/SR Equipment and Network line item by \$61,727 to \$1,794,955.

If you require any additional information please contact Karen Brown, 9-1-1 Projects Coordinator at 713.993.2486 or Vander Phelps, Public Safety Program Manager at 713.993.4543. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jack Steele

JS/kb

Scanning incomplete, however full text of letter follows:

City of Bay City
CHARLES MARTINEZ, JR, MAYOR

Bay City, Texas 77414
1901 Fifth Street
(979) 245-2137

January 25 2001

Advisory Commission an State Emergency Communications
333 Guadalupe Street, Suite 2-212
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

Dear Sirs,

We have been informed that you will consider approving installation of the City of Bay City's 911 PSAP at your meeting on February 8, 2001. As elected officials of the City Of Bay City, we would like to voice our support for a city 911 PSAP to be located at the Bay City Police Department Communications Center. Bay City Police Department PSAP Coordinator Teresa Spradlen has outlined numerous concerns that exist with the current set-up in Matagorda County (see attached letter). All of them stem from the fact that the only PSAP in the county is at the Matagorda County Sheriff's Department, and all city 911 calls must be transferred. We do not believe our citizens are receiving the best 911 service under the present structure.

Our city was originally scheduled to receive a PSAP several years ago. For various reasons (all of which originated locally and are no fault of yours), the project was postponed and finally put on hold indefinitely by your decision in August of 1999. We understand equipment previously used in Walker County is available for use here. The Houston-Galveston. Area Council (HGAC) also had money budgeted for the remainder of the equipment needed for the 911 PSAP. At some point that money was apparently removed from HGAC's budget and transferred to the state. We certainly feel it is in the best interest of our citizens that the money be re-allocated to HGAC and targeted for the City of Bay City 911 PSAP. At the time the project was suspended in 1999, we were in the middle of a renovation project. Our police department communications center was enlarged and now houses two console positions with all new electronic equipment. This was all done in preparation for housing our 911 PSAP.

We sincerely ask that you give this request serious consideration on February 8th. We are committed to the best service possible for our community. Thank you for your time. We look forward to your vote of confidence.

Sincerely,

Charles Martinez, Jr, Mayor

Anthony Hawkins, Mayor Pro-Tem

Booker T. Holbert, Councilman

Michael Kennedy, Councilman

Pasqual Martinez, Councilman

C. Glen Walker, Councilman