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MR. GARCIA: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to get this ABTPA Board meeting started. First of all, good morning again. My name is Carlos Garcia, and I am pleased to open the Board meeting of the Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention Authority. It is 9:02 a.m. and I am calling the Board meeting for January 18, 2017 to order, and I want to note for the record that the public notice of this meeting, containing all items on the agenda, was timely filed with the Office of Secretary of State on Monday, January 9, 2017.

Before we begin today's meeting, please place all cell phones and other communication devices in the silent mode.

If you wish to address the board during today's meeting, please complete a speaker's card at the registration table. To comment on an agenda item, please complete a yellow card and identify the agenda item. If it is not an agenda item, we will take your comments during the public comment portion of the meeting.

And now I'd like to have roll call of the board members.

Board Member Hunter?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Reynolds?
MR. REYNOLDS: Present.

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Ross?

MR. ROSS: Here.

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Hansen?

MR. HANSEN: Here.

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Mizani?

MR. MIZANI: Here.

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Kinney?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: And let the record reflect that I, Carlos Garcia, am here too, so we do have a quorum. And also let the record reflect that we have two members who at this time are absent today.

We don't have any public comments. Anybody signed up for public comments? I know we have one but that's for an agenda item and we'll address it at that time. If we don't, then we will move forward with our agenda.

So moving on to agenda item 1.B, the approval of transcript from October 12, 2016 board meeting as minutes. This is an action item, I do need a motion and a second.

MR. REYNOLDS: I make a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting on October 12, 2016.

MR. HANSEN: I'll second it.
MR. GARCIA: We have a motion by Board Member Reynolds and a second by Board Member Hansen regarding to approval of transcripts from October 12, 2016 board meeting. Any discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, all in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Public comments. I guess we didn't have anybody signed up for public comments.

Agenda item 1.D, comments from the chairman and board members, commendations and congratulations. I'll open it up to any of the board members for any comments at this time.

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, then we would like to recognize the following individuals for their dedicated service, not only to their agencies but also to ABTPA: Officer Ernesto "Ernie" Arredondo, El Paso Auto Theft Task Force, from 1989 to 2016; Senior Police Officer James Woods, Houston Automobile Crimes Task Force, from 1984 to 2016; Captain David Mitchell, Dallas County, North
Texas Auto Theft Task Force, from 1987 to 2017; Sergeant Shane McCoy, Harris County Sheriff's Office Auto Theft Unit, from 1987 to 2016.

So thank you to all those individuals for your efforts throughout the years in making this program a success and making your departments stand out.

Moving on to agenda item 2 on briefing and action items, agenda item 2.A, discuss and authorize staff to issue the FY18-19 request for applications. 2.A is issues for current and future funding cycles, and we'll start off with 2.A.1, the continued, modified and new grant categories.

Go ahead, Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. For the record, my name is Bryan Wilson, and I'll be presenting several items for your consideration and discussion that started over the last two years about reformatting some of the conditions and features of our current grant processes as we move forward. The first item is the new structure of grant applications, really kind of encapsulating what has been done in the history of ABTPA overall to restructure grant applications into three categories: continued, modified and new.

We spent quite a bit of time over the last eight-nine months since our strategic planning, talking
about ways to recognize the hardened resources, the highly trained motor vehicle theft investigators. Instead of even acting like we're going to play apple cart upside down every year or every two years, to recognize that jurisdictions, the cities, the counties that participate in this program have spent a lot of resources of their own, as well as state resources, building up infrastructure, building up quality individuals to serve in this capacity and to serve the state and their local communities. And so we wanted to look at a way to recognize in the grant program the effort that's already been put forth by this agency, as well as the local governments.

And one way to do that, after much discussion with Chief Garcia and other members, as well as the grantees, is to come up with a new method for making a grant application, what's called continued, modified and new, and that's described on page 12 in your board packet, and I’ll kind of give a general description. And if the board approves this in the RFA, then what we would issue is a call for grant applications that would have to fit into these categories.

So anybody who's currently getting a grant now would make application within 5 percent of any of the features of their current grant, whether staff, match,
ABTPA funding, and if they're currently receiving an FY17 grant, they would fill out the form pretty much looking like, within the 5 percent variant, what their grant looks like now. And that recognizes that we already have investigators, we already have support staff, we have cars, we have leases, and all the things that go with it.

The board would still have to make some choices about does that meet the statutory requirement, are there elements of that grant that need to be modified. The board still ultimately has the decision how much to give those grantees, but it starts with kind of an idea that we already have spent a lot of money at the local and state level in building these programs.

Then at the time when we get our appropriation, the board will come back later, they'll apply the point systems that we put in place between now and then, or continue the point systems that we currently have, and if we have the current funding, then I guess the presumption would be -- it doesn't bind the board on doing that, but the presumption will probably be that we'll examine the programs that we already have with the parameters that the board will decide at their discretion, and they're allowed legally to decide as long as it meets the statutory requirements.

The modified would be acknowledging that
current grantees would be in a good position to expand their program or make modifications, and they would come in and apply. First they would fill out their continued, and then I'm just making up examples, they would want five more officers to cover a bigger area or they might want to add jurisdictions into their grant, they would already have filled out their continued, and then they would say we'd like to expand or we need more equipment or we need more resources, so here's what we would do in addition to our continued grant.

And then the last type of grant would be the new, someone that we don't currently have infrastructure in place, we don't have specifically trained motor vehicle investigators that have been paid for by ABTPA. And in those cases the potential applicant would come in and say I'd like to start an auto theft program or spin off of one that is already in existence, or whatever. I don't know what they would look like, but we don't currently have those resources, those hardened resources in place, and they would make application for a new grant.

And then the board could then take in this schema, could take in order based on funding and based on priorities that you set -- and you're appointed by the governor to do this work -- you would make choices about what we have available and what we've already invested in.
So I'm proposing, I've put in there in the board book on page 12: Consider adopting a grant application process for FY18 RFA that allows for funding considerations in three funding categories or application categories.

MR. GARCIA: Okay, board members, this is where we discuss further or somebody makes a motion and somebody seconds it.

MR. HANSEN: I would like to have a discussion or comment for the grantees.

MR. GARCIA: Sure. Yes, sir.

MR. HANSEN: Tommy Hansen.

I know a lot of you are skeptical about this but there's been a lot of thought gone into this, and those that have been here for a while understand that, first of all, we never know what our money is going to be sometimes because of what goes on downtown, and that's a topic for later in the meeting. However, we're always asked for certain things and we want additions and it gets all convoluted into our regular grant application, and then if we get some of that or we get part of that or we don't get any of that or we get cut, or however it breaks down, then we have to go back and totally modify the original application and almost go through the whole process again with the commissioners or your city council and all this all over again because that's changed.
And what this does is streamlines the process that pretty much gives you credit. If you've got an operation going on now and you're doing what you're supposed to be doing and you're generating the numbers and your successful and you're meeting the criteria, then, you know, I don't see any obstacles here.

The secondary allows you if you need trucks or you need equipment or whatever you may need over and above, and if you get it, fine, if you don't, then you don't have to go back and modify your original grant, business moves forward. So it really streamlines and it makes it very clear if all your new stuff is not convoluted into your original grant application that you already have now and your staffing and your equipment or whatever you're already operating. We're not mixing all the new into the old, so this gives a much clearer picture if you're asking for something new, the board nor even your own staff has to filter through and read through the main grant to try to pick out what's the new stuff.

This separates that and it makes it a whole lot easier and streamlines this process for everybody in this room, because I know that's been a big complaint from everybody, particularly your bookkeepers or your counties and cities of how this grant works. So this is a step forward, in my personal opinion, having been on your side.
of this table as well for many years, to streamline some of this process for all of us. And I think it takes some steps out of it, particularly if we do get some new money this year, wonderful, that's great, but if we don't, then we're going to continue to move forward. So I want everybody to understand.

    New grant, that's self-explanatory. The only way you would have to do that if you're an existing program is if you're going to completely and totally change your mode of operation and you're going to shut it down and start over again, and I don't think anybody in this room is going to take that headache on, but that's up to you. And if we get more new money, then we may have some applicants that can work forward.

    But this is the concept behind this. And I was hoping more of you, I assume since you've done the meetings with Mr. Wilson's staff that you understand it since not too many people signed up to stand up here and talk about this. And I'm going to encourage that after this, if we move forward with this concept, that obviously we're going to have to have a workshop for everybody, hands on to make sure everybody gets it.

    MR. WILSON: Absolutely.

    MR. HANSEN: But this is the thought process behind this.
Thank you, Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Board Member Hansen.

Any other discussion by the board members?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, at this time then I'd like to see a motion and a second, approving or disapproving.

MR. MIZANI: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve item 2.A.1.

MR. GARCIA: Have a motion on the floor by Board Member Mizani.

MR. REYNOLDS: I'll second it.

MR. GARCIA: We have a second by Board Member Reynolds. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, all those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Moving on to agenda item 2.A.2, which is the biennial application process. Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. This is Bryan Wilson for the record again.
What we're asking for consideration -- and again, this has been part of our discussion with the task forces for several months, as well as the meetings that we've looked at our processes, and we actually did a trial run. I really didn't plan it this year but when we carried forward the '16, when we realized we didn't get any new money and there was no major reason to do whole new applications, we kind of did a dry run, took the '16 applications, allowed jurisdictions to make some slight modifications to get their budgets in line and validate themselves within their own governments, and then just re-awarded based pretty much on the '16 with slight changes.

So really, we're kind of institutionalizing that process. Every two years grant applicants will be able to make an application. The board still has to make choices about awarding. Again, I'm just making up an example, but if somebody bought ten trucks in year one of the grant application and they only have ten people, they're not going to get ten new trucks the second year, so the board has to make choices even in the second year. That's why it's not a two-year award cycle, it's a two-year application cycle, and then the parts that would be wasteful or inappropriate to carry forward in the second year, in other words, kind of startup costs or major equipment purchases, things like that, would need to be
removed for the applications moving forward in the second year.

So if they added new staff, say in their modified application, so they had ten officers, they added five more, as an example -- again, I'm just making up specific examples and what the intention is and getting it on record so we have a record to come back to -- but the grant application intention is if somebody applied for modified grant and added five new officers, that would, of course, carry over into the second year as long as they were the kind of officers that were supported, not temporary positions. So that would carry forward and in the second year they would get the award for those salary and staff positions. But big one-time purchases would not automatically carry forward.

So as a result, and I laid that out in this board request, but as far as modifications that people get salary changes during that two-year period, we still have a grant adjustment process. People are taking advantage of their 5 percent. We've made it real clear that we're not going to do every little adjustment that comes along that the board has already set a rule of 5 percent, so people have the ability to move money at their discretion without coming to the state every single time they need a new postage stamp or a new paper clip or whatever. We've
fixed that, I think, pretty well, and now they recognize when there's major changes that are greater than 5 percent, and that would still be available under this process. So during the two years if you got into a notice moment that you didn't have the right category, you could still come back to the director and ask for a budget adjustment.

Are there any questions?

MR. GARCIA: Any questions or comments by any of the board members?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none and there are no public comments on this, then we do need a motion to authorize and a second.

MR. HANSEN: I make a motion that we move forward with 2.A.2.

MR. REYNOLDS: I'll second.

MR. GARCIA: A motion on the floor by Board Member Hansen and a second by Board Member Reynolds to approve the biennial application process. Any additional discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: There is none. All in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)
MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Moving on to agenda item 2.A.3, total program budget. Before Mr. Wilson, Mr. Richard Hale.

MR. HALE: Thank you, Board, Mr. Wilson. My name is Richard Hale with the Sheriffs Combined Auto Theft Task Force.

I'm here today to talk about agenda item 2.A.3 which is the total program budget, and from my understanding and discussions about this, this particular category encompasses what Mr. Wilson was talking about earlier where instead of writing checks from like five different checkbooks, we're going to be writing a check from one checkbook which is a much better accounting process.

Along with that, some of the concerns I have in working with the grant is that we use seized funds under the grant category to use in program income, and most of the grantees, I would assume, are using a majority of their grant award for salaries, and so their direct operating expenses that they have every day, the categories they use to buy equipment, supplies, et cetera, come from the seized account. And so therefore, since that category is a fluctuating account that one month to
the next month we may seize certain items under Chapter 47 and we may not. Currently that account I obligated for match to the grant and it's also utilized for program income.

So I would urge the board when you financially look at the future of funding some of the grants that you consider that those seized funds accounts be separated from the grant because we don't know what percentage they're going to be on a consistent basis, and then when you make the grant award, if we are successful at the legislative level to get the funding that we need, that you program into the grant those direct operating expenses because you can quickly find yourself behind the eight ball in your seized fund account if you have to use that for match.

So that today I would ask that under the total program budget that you consider plugging that component in and separating those two for those that use program income out of their seized account. I would assume there are several grantees in the room that operate under that model and that that model kind of be steered away from and that those funds be held separately. And then of course, they do belong to the state and if we had to use them, we would use the current processes available to the grantees to ask for those expenditures.
And I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have about that.

MR. GARCIA: Board members, questions for Mr. Hale?

MR. HANSEN: Tommy Hansen.

You and I discussed this, and several other people in the room too, and you're right and I totally agree, I think the profits or seized funds have historically been our rainy day account, they have been our lifesaver to many of the programs, and I don't really feel that they should be a part of the match. I'm going to be disputed legally on that, but I agree with that, that that should be used because there are a lot of certain things that the grants will not pay for that come up and that is the only way that we can accomplish that particular detail is by using seized funds. And there is no rhyme or reason to seized funds, and I get that. You can have a year where you may not have anything.

And I know that a lot of programs, that account comes out of, say, if they're buying new vehicles and they sell the old ones, that money goes in there, but when we're in tight times or we're not getting money to buy new vehicles, we're not selling any vehicles and we're not having any program income. Because for a lot of the task forces, depending on how they're designed, they're not
going to get seizures, that's not part of their normal operating procedure of what they do every day.

So I do think that that needs to be up for discussion some more.

MR. HALE: Thank you. And the other component to that would be renewal of the grant process that we just went through where we just basically were awarded the same amount that we were the year before where we didn't have an opportunity to say what we would match. So we were essentially matching the same amount that we did the year before, and that account may not have had enough money in it at the time, so we really didn't have an opportunity to do that. So when you go to a biennium application process, that becomes even more crucial based on what money you may have available to meet that match and have the direct operating expenses that you may need. So I think it's a crucial component that needs to be considered moving forward.

MR. GARCIA: Would this require some type of a rule change?

MR. WILSON: No. I don't think he's arguing against the total program budget, it's just how we handle program income.

MR. GARCIA: I understand that.

MR. WILSON: Okay. I just want to be sure. So
I don't think that affects this what he's talking about. Part of the request for applications is setting up the processes that go around it.

But I do want to say a couple of things, if you don't mind. This is Bryan Wilson, for the record.

Number one, only about three or four grantees have significant amounts of program income, so this is kind of a non-issue for many of the grant programs. And we call it program income because that's what the statute calls it, and it's any money generated as a result of a program being funded, so it includes 68(a) fee inspections, it includes seized assets, I think there's been cash -- it seems I was in Houston or somewhere this past year and there was some cash seized -- so it can be anything that is a direct result of generation of the activities funded by the state.

So the first thing is it's a non-issue for many of them just because the program balance is so small, it's really tiny. The second thing is this was a major audit finding a couple of years ago in 2014 that we didn't have appropriate controls for the program income.

And so we didn't change how they're allowed to use it, so under a normal funding model, if somebody generates funds that we were 80-20, just say for instance, then under the Texas Uniform Grant Management Standards,
that would be 80 percent state funds and 20 percent at the
discretion of the jurisdiction. So in many cases what the
normal process in many grants is you would reduce the
grant award. So if I gave Travis County a half million
dollars in grant funds and they generated $100,000 in
program income, I would reduce their award by $80,000 so
they would have $420,000. That's what the rules say we're
supposed to do. We don't do that, we never have, so I
didn't change that. I said we actually allow the
jurisdictions to use that money, the three or four that
generate it, they can use it for cash match, physically
100 percent as if it belonged to the jurisdiction.

So we have a very generous policy, in my
opinion, much more generous than what the state law is or
the program rules. And it's my policy. This board has
chosen, that was the practice, I wrote it into the grant
administrative manual, that's what we've been doing, and I
have no intention under the total program budget
consideration of changing anything about that.

The final issue is just really about at no
point is it ever supposed to be a slush fund. That's
illegal in Texas, contingency funds are illegal -- well,
there's my attorney, but as far as I know, they're not
allowed. County commissioners, city councils have the
authority to budget funds and state entities must budget
funds. You can't have my just-in-case fund, it's not 
allowed under Texas law.

But again, they've held that money in abeyance, 
they hold it many times in separate accounts, and then 
they call and say I'd like to do a budget adjustment and I 
would like to spend $20,000 on a pickup, $5,000 on bait 
equipment, whatever it is, and my standard is always 
reasonable and necessary as determined by the local 
jurisdiction. These guys are sick and tired of me saying 
reasonable and necessary. But the reality is if they 
demonstrate in writing that it's reasonable and necessary 
for their operation of the program, they're pretty much 
going to get it. I mean, it has to be pretty big flashing 
red lights that I'm in trouble here for me, and even then, 
I'd probably bring it to you. My staff gets mad at me 
sometimes because I don't like to say no. When a police 
officer, if Lieutenant Richbourg is saying this is 
something that needs to be done, I'm not in a good 
stead -- Chief Garcia, you heard some of that yesterday -- 
I'm not in a good stead to tell people who are 
professional law enforcement folks that they can't do what 
they need to do.

So anyway, that's the last issue is that you 
can't have contingency, but it gets brought into the 
budget as directed or requested by the jurisdiction. Now,
Travis County in the past has used that money for match in lieu of county money. I want to be clear about this. Others have as well, the ones that carry cash balances. Nothing in this program proposal is asking for change of that process.

MR. GARCIA: Mr. Hale.

MR. HALE: I'm in total agreement with what Mr. Wilson just said, however, the problem is that because of the fluctuating balances in the account -- I wouldn't call it a slush fund, but it can drop depending on what happens in your grant year, and so you may fall short in that grant cycle because of things that are out of your control, and therefore, that makes it, to me, kind of sketchy. And it has been used in the past for that reason, and so all I'm simply asking is looking for the funding moving forward, if you're able to move toward those direct operating expenses being included in the grant award as opposed to that seized fund account being as a funding source totally for program income because it can become problematic if you don't have those funds to meet your match. And I don't think any grantee wants to be in that status.

That's simply what I'm talking about. It's a consideration request, it's a conversation.

MR. HANSEN: And if I understand this right,
Mr. Richards, the problem I think we're getting at is if we have this amount of money -- and it's going really go forward if we're going to go to this new grant process -- if you have this amount of money in the first year, seizure money that's going to go towards your operating expenses, then in the second year you don't have that. Say you had no seizures and you're down $50-, $60,000, then that's going to put you back into a bind for the second year of that grant application. Is that what I'm getting what you're saying?

MR. HALE: Yes, sir.

MR. HANSEN: So then that would really put the responsibility for that to be brought to the attention of the board that last year $80,000 of their operating expenses as seized money but this year they didn't have it, they didn't get any awards, so now they're short $80,000. Is it right to cut the program $80,000, or would it be more suitable that we try to find a way to keep them at that level that they are? Does that make sense?

MR. WILSON: Yes. Actually, we had that happen, not related to program income but just related to county match. We had that happen twice when you awarded the '17 awards back in, what was that, May of last year. I brought you a slate of things and I said, Well, these two programs cannot currently meet their match. Like I
said, in this case it did not have to do with program income. We had a change in Brownsville, we had a change in Beaumont where they had bought a bunch of equipment with their match last year but they didn't want to buy new equipment and they wanted to reduce their match. And that's what we do, we bring it to the board and say: Well, these two want to lower their match by a certain percentage. And the board voted to say okay. I mean, they were pretty small amounts and that's fine.

But that's what the board is for is to say -- whether it's program income or just a particular county is having a budget crisis, whatever that problem is, we would say: Okay, they need to lower their match by $60-, $70,000. But again, I do want to point out that isn't related to the total program budget, that's just about match issues and how we administer the grant, but it's not related to what's before you on the total program budget.

MR. HANSEN: So this would boil down to that it's up to the grantees to make sure there's communication, that if you've had a dramatic drop in your second year in your program income, that that needs to be recognized so we can find a remedy for that which would fall back on here.

MR. HALE: The proper funding.

MR. HANSEN: Does that make sense?
MR. RICHARDS: Absolutely.

MR. HALE: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, sir, Mr. Hale.

Any additional discussion by the board members on total program budget.

MR. WILSON: Can I lay this out real quick?

MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: So let me lay this concept out for you real quick. We're on page 16. And one of the things I just want to make sure is currently we have less than 25 percent of our grantees that are able to complete a substantiated expenditure report, and it's really brought home how we manage. Because right now what an application entails is that they chop up their expenditures into little buckets, regardless of how they're related to each other, and what we're really trying to move to in this total program budget concept is that you just tell me every year how much money you need, tell me how much match you're going to provide. And I did say every year, so there's an application done every two years but then every year you have to re-up that in a total program schema, and you tell me how much that you want to give in match.

And then cities and counties keep things -- I've been to twelve of them now -- and they keep things in object codes and classifications, so if you have a grant,
the budget people usually assign a number to that grant. You know, it's like 4608 in Dallas, or it might be 5201 in Houston, or whatever, but they assign a number, and then that's how they track in their books. Under the total program budget, we've never done this, but it's how many grants operate is you just tell me how much money you need, how much you're going to put up as a percent or as a total dollar value, and then all of your reimbursement are based on your actual costs for that time period less your match. So if it's 80-20 and you spend $100,000 in that quarter, I'm giving you $80,000, that's all I'm giving you because that was our agreement.

So now the books begin to reflect the direct costs that the city and the county is tracking because they track personnel, they track fringe very clearly, there's no question that they track how much they pay their people or how much the fringe percentage. And so I just want to be able to pay my percentage of the personnel or the fringe or whatever it is and that's what we're asking is to go to a total program budget. Every grant cycle you'll turn in your budget, we'll agree on a percentage.

And to Mr. Hale's point, if there's some change in the city, that's what that interim time period is -- as we did for Brownsville and Beaumont this past year -- you
will just tell me: Hey, guys, we're having a city problem or my city council won't meet this match, would you lower it. Then the board can make that choice; Bryan is not going to make that choice; the board has to make that choice. But you did it in the past and I think you'll look at each.

I mean, at the end of the day, we're trying to promote motor vehicle theft and burglary reduction, that's what we do. It's not about splitting hairs with counties and cities, it's about getting our job done. And this is to streamline that. More time and effort spent on doing police work, less on bookkeeping.

MR. GARCIA: If any grantee would come forward and make that request of reducing their match, in no way does it increase their award at that time either. Right?

MR. WILSON: If somebody came in and decreased their match, their percentage might go up but their award doesn't change. Again, only the board can set award amounts or approve percentages or amounts of match. Bryan does not do that. We've got it written into our policy, Bryan absolutely will not do that. But Bryan will bring it back to the board for you to consider.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you.

Any additional discussion?

(No response.)
MR. GARCIA: If there is none, we need a motion to approve and a second.

MR. REYNOLDS: I make a motion to approve the total program budget process.

MR. ROSS: I'll second it.

MR. GARCIA: We have a motion on the floor to approve the total program budget by Board Member Reynolds and a second by Board Member Ross. If there is no further discussion, all those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Before we move on to the rest of the agenda, at this time I want to tell the board members -- I'm trying to rush you through the agenda -- at about 10:30 I will go into a five-minute break, I will excuse myself and I need to head back to Brownsville for an important meeting this afternoon at 5:30, so I just want to make sure I have plenty of time on the road.

Second, I am looking for a volunteer from the board members to run the meeting if we have not finished the agenda by then.

MR. REYNOLDS: I can do that, sir.

MR. GARCIA: You can do that?
MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: All right. Great.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Board Member Reynolds. I appreciate that.

MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: So moving on to agenda item 2.B, priorities for the new and modified grant requests. 2.B.1, the cooperative priority. Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Okay. So do you want to take these one at a time or as a slate or whatever?

MR. GARCIA: I think we'll take them as a slate.

MR. WILSON: Okay. So I'll just run through these five items, and if anybody wants to split them out or have further discussion. But I do want to say the board authorized me in February to have a strategic planning conference, we had that strategic planning conference. The board has adopted an outline and out of that outline has come some priorities.

Now, you remember I talked earlier about our current grantees have hardened resources, trained motor vehicle theft investigators, and we have resources, hardened resources, bait, LPR, vehicles, and so I'm not asking for this priority schema to apply to the current...
grantees, although I certainly encourage and I think the board should hold these out as the methods, but out of discussions in San Antonio that we had with the program directors, out of discussions that we had at the strategic planning, we identified some core concepts that we have adopted in our strategic plan, they went into our plan of operation.

And what we're asking for is when we publish the RFA for next year that we set priorities for all new and modified grants that are consistent with our plan of operation submitted to the legislature and also with our strategic planning process. And these five items are the cooperative priority which means if we're going to expand any grantee on a modified or a new that it's going to be because they operate as a cooperative, that they collaborate together, that they're expanding jurisdictions and they operate as a task force as opposed to individually funded units. And I'm just giving you the high level and we can come back.

That whatever grants that we expand into will have a component of crime analysts and trend analysis to make sure that we're using our resources as wisely as possible. That any expansion of our programs in modified or new would include an effort to combat pattern crimes, organized crime, and specifically different kinds of
economic crime which is set out in our statute. That came out in our statute but our strategic planning results agreed with that.

That whenever possible that we'll try to figure out a way to fund co-location so we get the best bang for our bucks on our resources. If people have bait, if they have LPRs, if they have equipment, but again, it's new and modified that they try to operate organizationally as a unit. And that even like surveillance equipment and things like that would be available to other jurisdictions that are close by, because if we have resources put together, then if we're here in Travis County, that Williamson County could use that even if they're not necessarily an element, or the City of Round Rock. But that way it expands our reach and our effectiveness within not just the areas we fund but greater areas.

I know a lot of you are already doing that all the time. I know we talked to Smith County when we were there a while back, and I'm not picking them out but just because that just jumped to mind seeing Kenneth sitting there, and they're reaching out to Longview and providing resources and assistance. So we want to institutionalize that process.

And then in the future if we do expansion on new and modified grants, that we include prosecutorial
elements. A big complaint has been of this group is:

Man, we do these great workups on burglary or an auto
theft but they don't want to pursue that case or that's
not the priority for our prosecutorial unit. Well, one
way you get around that is we want to include funding for
those kind of elements.

Now, again, this is already stuff you've
already seen. I've kind of recapsulized it in a way that
I can put it into an RFA. Now, we certainly have a lot
more things in our strategic plan that didn't make it into
this list but this is what we had talked about in San
Antonio with the project coordinators and directors,
program managers and directors, and so this is what staff
recommends that you consider making these five items for
this cycle the priorities going forward if we get new or
expanding programs.

MR. GARCIA: Any discussion by board members on
agenda items B.1 through 5?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, this is an
action item so I do need a motion and a second.

MR. MIZANI: I make a motion to approve item
2.B.

MR. GARCIA: We have a motion on the floor.

MR. HANSEN: I'll second it.
MR. GARCIA: By Board Member Mizani and a second by Board Member Hansen. Any further discussion?
(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: There is none. All in favor say aye.
(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?
(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Moving on to agenda item 2.C.1 and 2, process modifications. Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Okay. So 2014 after the internal audit there were a couple of things that came up as a result of the issues that were adopted by the board, and so anything that I see in a transcript that's adopted by the board, I'm not crossing that line, I'll bring it back to the board to reconsider. But one of the things is that the board voted in the redesign module to allow monthly progress reports, and I'm fine with reporting data monthly but I'm beginning to realize that it's just a tremendous amount of work for staff as well as the projects.

They should keep up with arrest data by month, they should keep up with cases cleared by month, those are logical progression, as well as many of their activities, but when it comes to summarizing what they do or what
their priorities are in the report process, we'd really like to move to a quarterly submission. They can still keep their monthly progress reports if they prefer and came out of the redesign, but it just comes to us once every quarter, and that lines up with our payment process, we're currently on a quarterly payment process. We can just simply look at did they turn in their report, did their expense report come in, boom, pay.

So the first one is just considering in the next grant cycle that we move to quarterly progress reports. I'll also be talking to you in a few minutes about some computer systems that we're working and those systems are already designed around quarterly. We'd have to do major modifications to change that.

The second issue is the scoring method. Based on the vote earlier with the new and the modified, the current redesign scoring process -- or the method that was adopted in the redesign work in 2014 does not fit into the new and modified for prioritizing that we just had a discussion on earlier, so I'm proposing to redo the scoring system and bring it back to you later in the spring, so just need authority to do that so I can go ahead and work on that during the interim.

MR. GARCIA: Before we move further with any type of discussion on this agenda item, I'd like the
record to reflect that Board Member Ashley Hunter is present. So welcome, and thank you for joining us.

    MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

    MR. GARCIA: So any discussion by the board members at this time on agenda item C.1 or C.2? Go ahead, Mr. Hansen.

    MR. HANSEN: Real quick concerning 2. I know a scoring method is a heartburn for most everybody in this room, and I want to assure you that Mr. Wilson and I and Mr. Garcia and others, there will be a lot of discussion to make sure that this is done in a fair fashion so we don't run into some issues that we've done before facing some things. We want to make sure that if there's any statistics used, that they're accurate, up to snuff, and up to deals before anybody is graded. I want to give you that promise on 2, because I know that was heartburn in the past and we're going to try to make that right.

    Thank you.

    MR. GARCIA: Any further discussion by the board members on items C.1 and C.2?

    (No response.)

    MR. GARCIA: If there is none, then this is an action item so I do need a motion and a second.

    MR. REYNOLDS: I'll make a motion to go forward with the process modifications.
MR. GARCIA: A motion on the floor by Board Member Reynolds.

MR. HANSEN: I'll second.

MR. GARCIA: And second by Board Member Hansen.

Again, any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: There is none. All those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

Moving on to agenda item 3, authorization to enter into agreement with Texas A&M University -- let me back up a little bit here. It's my understanding from the director that we do need a motion to authorize staff to publish the FY18 request for applications. So we do need a motion and a second.

MR. HANSEN: Motion to move forward for staff posting the '18-19 application process.

MR. REYNOLDS: Second.

MR. GARCIA: Motion on the floor by Board Member Hansen to authorize staff to publish the FY18-19 or just '18?

MR. WILSON: Well, just '18.
MR. GARCIA: The FY18 request for applications. That's right. And a second by Board Member Reynolds.

Any discussion by the board members at this time?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, all those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries. Thank you.

Now moving on to agenda item 3, authorization to enter into agreement with Texas A&M University to configure and deploy grant management and tracking systems. Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Chief. This is Bryan Wilson for the record, and I just wanted to call your attention to page 22 on the board book.

Basically there's two issues that we would like to resolve today. I've already come to you in the past asking you for up to $50,000 to do a grant management tracking system, originally with Texas A&M, then we went out to a private vendor. At that time A&M had got some federal work. We kind of lollygagged around and they got some federal work and they couldn't do our project. We went out for a private bid. It was substantial. That's
about all I can say right now. It was a tremendous amount of money to do a system, and we all have Big Chief tablets and number 2 pencils, so we could get by on less.

So I decided to contact A&M again. Again, this is a system that's already been developed for the state court system, it's used by the Governor's Office, Juvenile Justice System, it was used for the HAVA grants, it's a grant management system, that's pretty much all it does, it does a couple other things for the courts. So they've agreed to look at it again, they gave me a price, so I'd like to get authorization to spend up to $60,000 this year. They proposed a three-year cost structure. If we get going right away, they think they can modify it in time for this year's grant applications, or the 2018 grant by March 1, and then as long as we're clear that TxDMV has the authorization to enter into a contract on your behalf to implement the system.

And so here are some of the features I put on those pages. If you're morbidly curious on how much the deliverables will be, we set up deliverables and it's currently being reviewed. These are drafts for your records, but Texas DMV and legal have to still review the final deliverables schedule and amounts.

But I would like the authorization to spend up to $60,000 this year and it will have all the expenditure
reports and everything going forward.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. This is an action item. Any discussion by the board members of this request?

MR. MIZANI: Bryan, just to clarify, so when you just explained was the bidding process, you reached out to a private vendor and then that's when you reached out to A&M afterwards?

MR. WILSON: Right. We originally wanted to go to A&M, and then that fell through, so we went out for -- I came back to you, I don't know, it was the spring, February, somewhere, May, you authorized me to go out to bid with the $50,000. It came back a lot higher than that, so now I'm coming back and saying I went back to A&M. We can speak to state agencies without any kind of conflict, so I opened that communication back up, of course, with DMV's permission, I don't do anything on my own, and this is what they've come back with.

MR. MIZANI: And so then prior to this management tracking system, pardon my lack of knowledge, what have been doing prior?

MR. WILSON: Prior to '15, we have been using a system that came from TxDOT that cost, I think, $260,000 is what I've been able to pin on it. The budgets didn't add up, the budgets didn't carry, it was a system that absolutely did not work, and I think most of the grantees
were not particularly happy with how difficult it was to submit changes. So what we've been doing, as a result of the redesign there was such significant changes, we've actually been doing everything by Excel spreadsheets, and then for certain items, because we don't have a validation process, we're actually making them do a signed copy sent in with an Excel version to validate that our numbers are correct. And by going to an online system, it might be Aggie math but it generally adds up.

MR. MIZANI: When you said 260K, that answered my question.

And in the year three and ongoing, that's $25,000, so that's for the duration?

MR. WILSON: Once we finish the development side -- in other words, what it does for the courts and the Governor's Office is a little different, so like with the courts it only does counties so Harris County is already in the system but the City of Tyler is not, so we're having to do some reformatting so that cities and counties can be in the system.

I got with DPS. Thank you, Major Reynolds. The whole system will be based on ORI configurations. Mr. Hansen and I have been talking for a while about how to attribute properly to what programs or inside of our program and participating, and so we'll be using it based
on law enforcement assigned ORIs. So I think it's going
to be a huge improvement.

MR. MIZANI: Thanks, Bryan.

MR. GARCIA: Any additional discussion at this
time by the board members?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: If there is none, this is an
action item so we need a motion and a second.

MR. MIZANI: I make a motion to approve item 3

MR. ROSS: Second it.

MR. GARCIA: We do have a motion on the floor
by Board Member Mizani and a second by Board Member Ross.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: All those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

I'm going to move an agenda item out of order,
and that's agenda item number 8, committee appointments.

I'm going to move it up.

MR. WILSON: Page 57.

MR. GARCIA: Mr. Wilson, can you give us a
briefing before we move on with this agenda item?
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MR. WILSON: Sure. Thank you, Chief.

One of the things, as I've been here the last two years, is it's come to my attention through just various negotiations that I've had that sometimes I need some board member input that needs to be targeted for very specific purposes. I've asked the chair to consider setting up some committees, I've asked him to place very careful and clear charges on those committees about what their role would be. I submitted this, we looked at it the last meeting in May, and so the chair wanted to give you time to consider this and my request, and at that time he took opportunity to allow the board members to volunteer for specific committees, and this is what I've put in the packet today. We went back and pulled the transcripts, Mary Beth reviewed that and put it together.

So we're continuing to ask that this is the format where I seem to need help. In other words, I need sometimes help with grants, budgets and reports. We do these statutory required reports, but I'd like to have board members more involved. Ultimately, I work for DMV but I serve this board, and I think because you have statutory requirements of collecting money, of giving refunds, but that some level of committee would be very helpful because of statutory charges that you have that I certainly carry out for you but I don't always have the
clear authority and it would be better if some of you participated in what I'm doing, and that's what I've proposed.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

So for the first committee on the Grants, Budgets and Reports Committee, I have Board Member Reynolds, Board Member Hansen, and I also understand Board Member Hunter on this committee.

MS. HUNTER: Okay, yes.

MR. GARCIA: That's what I was told.

MS. HUNTER: That conversation happened.

(General laughter.)

MR. GARCIA: All right. And just to appoint somebody to kind of chair the committee, I'm going to appoint Board Member Hansen on this.

On the Insurance Collections and Refund Committee, Board Member Mizani, Board Member Ross and Board Member Hunter. And appointing a chairman here, I'll appoint Board Member Mizani, who is willing to undertake that.

MR. MIZANI: Sure.

MR. GARCIA: Education and Legislative Committee, Board Member Hansen, Board Member Kinney and Board Member Ken Ross, and I'm going to appoint Board Member Kinney as chair that committee.
MR. WILSON: That should teach her never to
miss a meeting again.

(General laughter.)

MR. GARCIA: This is not an action item.
So we'll go back to the agenda in order.

Agenda item 4, discussion about the 85th Legislative
Session.

MR. WILSON: Okay. I know what I told you,
that we were going to just take up one little bill that
cleaned up some Highway Department language out of our
statute earlier this year, but there's been a couple of
items that have come up that I want to make sure that we
go ahead and cover. So on page 26, I have the document
that we would like you to consider authorizing me and GSC,
the Government and Strategic Communications Department, to
modify some language in our bills. And this comes out of
several conversations with other stakeholders.

One of the things, as I've been traveling
around, these great fine law enforcement officials often
have to deal with Transportation Code criminal violations
on a regular basis. Somebody steals a car, they get a
fake plate offline or they buy one illegally off of
Facebook, and so they're doing a lot of the work anyway.
Our statute limits them to motor vehicle theft and
burglary, yet they get pulled into so many different other
areas. Well, one way we can fix that is to broaden our statutory requirements to include -- and again, I want to be careful to make sure everybody here understands, I'm talking about the criminal violations of the Transportation Code. We're not asking these guys to become DMV enforcers or anything like that, but that Transportation Code citation in 1001.002(b) has a list of criminal penalties that are related often, not always, but related often, and if we get new money, we would hope that we could be able to expand into some of these areas, especially those that affect burglary and motor vehicle, which many of these do.

One example that's often, I know I've been working with several task forces on odometer fraud. That's in Transportation Code, the criminal violation of odometer fraud is in there. We currently are pushed in the middle of those kind of fraud cases because of theft or related to theft, but we're not able to work those cases currently. So that would clarify our statutory language.

So why we're fixing it, there's some places in our statute when burglary was added to our statute, it was left out of key places that we think it needs to be in, and we've been operating with the assumption that it says burglary under some of these areas, but we'd like to go
ahead and clean that up as well.

And then the last one is on page 29, it's kind of tied to our TxDOT cleanup that you adopted earlier this year. We are still required to submit reports to TxDOT, even though our reports have nothing to do with transportation, highways or anything like that, so we'd like to extract our name, your good name, Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention Authority, out of the TxDOT statute.

Is Matthew back there? Matthew is our designee from Government and Strategic Communications. He's hiding behind the pillar. He said I did fine.

MR. GARCIA: This is an action item. Any discussion by the board members at this time?

MR. MIZANI: Bryan, just one question. I'm trying to make sense and maybe I'm just reading it wrong, on page 27, subsection (b)(3) at the very end: "and violations of the statutes referenced in Sec 8(a)(7)."

Right?

MR. WILSON: Right.

MR. MIZANI: And I go to 8(a)(7), that's this part right here on page 28?

MR. WILSON: 28, yes, sir.

MR. MIZANI: But then that lists statutes listed in Section 1001.002(b) of the Transportation Code.
So then is it taking the one section and then that takes me to another section?

MR. WILSON: Correct.

MR. MIZANI: Can we tidy that up and just say reference to? Am I reading that wrong?

MR. WILSON: I think because the plan of operation -- I'm fine with what you're saying. In other words, what you'd like to see is on the plan of operation it would just say: and any violation of statutes under 1001.002 of the Transportation Code.

MR. MIZANI: Right.

MR. WILSON: And that's fine.

Matthew, is there any problem with that, just doing a direct reference in the section under plan of operation?

MATTHEW: (Speaking from audience.) We can do that.

MR. MIZANI: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Any additional discussion?

MR. HANSEN: Just on behalf of the grantees, this has been a thorn again for a lot of them because we know we get involved in title frauds and stuff like that. You should be involved with them because you're the experts in the state but by statute some of that didn't fall under there, and Mr. Wilson is doing due diligence of
his job to remind us of that all the time, but
unfortunately sometimes we still have to do that. In many
cases it's directly connected. So this allows all of us
to continue to do what we're doing within statute without
any question, so this is probably ten years overdue to
move forward with this, though.

Thank you for your work on this.

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Any additional discussion by the
board members?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: This is an action item so I do
need a motion and a second. Any volunteers?

MR. REYNOLDS: I'll make a motion that we go
forward with the request for legislative change.

MR. MIZANI: I'll second.

MR. GARCIA: By Board Member Mizani on the
second. Any additional discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: There is none. All those in favor
say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.
Agenda item 4.B, report on the legislative appropriation request FY18-19

MR. WILSON: Thank you. For the record, this is Bryan Wilson.

Starting on page 31, I just wanted to remind you of what we're currently requesting. We were required by the legislature to submit our appropriation request with a 4 percent cut. That's the $14.3 million you see at the top of page 31. I am pleased to report, although some people might disagree, I'm pleased to report that yesterday the LBB released the first draft of the budget and they included $14.3 million at the starting point for our discussion on the budget. So I know that sounds bad but if you start somewhere north of zero, you're starting in a good spot, and we'll see what happens from there.

So anyway, I wanted to show you what the breakdown is by year and for the biennium, and then also on page 32, the performance measures that are tied to that. So it comes with a price. In other words, we're saying: give us more money, we'll reduce motor vehicle theft, we'll reduce losses. That's what we're asking, and it's a two-headed dragon.

MR. GARCIA: But that $14.3- that's on file right now, that does include the 4 percent reduction that was requested by the governor. Right?
MR. WILSON: Right. That's the $14.3 in that top line. Thank you, Chief, for making sure.

So the two appropriation request items, the exceptional items -- that's what they call them in LBB speak, Legislative Budget Board -- is the first thing we're asking for is the restoration of the $596,000, and the second thing we're asking for is an additional $12.6 million to provide more officers, analysts, prosecutors and things like that.

MR. GARCIA: That's just strictly for informational purposes?

MR. WILSON: That's correct. No action is required on that.

MR. GARCIA: So moving on to item 4.C, the report on House Bill 652, dedicated account bill.

MR. WILSON: I'll go ahead and start on that. If Mr. Hansen wants to add some additional information, he can after I finish.

So House Bill 652 was filed by Clardy a few weeks ago. Many of the task force directors and commanders were invited to participate in a phone call that basically what this bill does, it does not provide -- and I want everybody to be clear -- it does not provide any additional money to ABTPA. What it does it set aside the money that is collected by ABTPA through a contract.
with the Comptroller's Office, it sets that money aside into a dedicated account as a sub-account of Texas DMV Fund. It's real important, and that was one thing that we had voted on this several months ago and had lots of discussion around that, but at this point, we left it up to Representative Clardy as to put half or all of the funds, and so the starting point is all of the funds collected. That's $46.5 million this fiscal year, the one that just closed, and it's estimated to be over the next couple of years well over $48 million.

So now that this bill is filed then there will be some paperwork that would allow other jurisdictions and senators and representatives to sign on to sponsorship or co-author, depending on what that status within the committees, and so that will be up to the legislative process going forward.

MR. GARCIA: Board Member Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: I've been on contact virtually with everyone in this room in some fashion or form, all the project directors and all the commanders concerning all of this, and we're going to go into some of this again but I want to give you an update. As of yesterday afternoon -- I was at the Capitol all day yesterday -- as of yesterday, Representative Clardy signed off on the bill to open it up for co-sponsors. The more House members
that we can get, and I know you're tired of hearing this, to put their name on that bill, the better chance we have of getting it passed.

I also spent time yesterday, and if you have one I mind that we need to focus with, that's fine, but we also need to get a companion bill, a sister bill to this on the Senate side, and there was some communications with several legislators yesterday, one being a very key senator who has been a big supporter of us in the past, to no avail, but not his fault. So for us to even have a chance to get all of this, it's going to require that.

And I've sent every one of you some sample resolutions and letters that need to not only come from your administrators but if you have a police officers association. I know we've gotten communication like Houston Police Officers Association, Dallas PD, San Antonio and a number of others, TMPA, NICB, we're working on that. But those letters, I cannot stress to you, based on a conversation yesterday with Kelly at Representative Clardy's office, how important they're going to be. And as soon as we can get a companion bill filed in the Senate, you're going to need to send them again to that person for them to have, but they also need to go to your legislators to encourage them to sign off and co-sponsor on this bill.
Now, I'm going to be very frank, right now based on House Bill 1541, which was our last enabling legislation, we're only entitled to the one dollar, and I think everyone in this room, if we could finally get the one dollar after all these years it would be Mardi Gras. Whether we get the second dollar, that remains to be seen, but that could also be a negotiations tool to get us to where we need to be to finally get our one dollar that we're actually entitled to today based on House Bill 1541 that was passed in a previous session. So that's where we are so we need to focus on the basics first of let's getting our dollar, and then if we get the rest of it, we'll move forward, but that's where we are today.

So those of you, I've communicated with everyone in this room multiple times via email and phone calls and phone conversations, and it's not hard. Just yesterday in just a couple of hours I went into ten offices yesterday and many of them were your legislators' offices. So it doesn't take any time to do it but you need to do it and do it quickly. Because what Clardy's staff told me yesterday is this probably won't hit the ground running for testimony in some committees for a little bit of time. You all saw and it's all over the news yesterday what the House and what the Senate put as their starting budgets, and there was quite a bit of
difference between them, however, the comptroller has already alluded that, you know, I don't think this money crunch is quite as bad as it seems to be.

By the time we get to that, he wants to be able to -- and we'll do this with the Senate -- have a one-page letter written for him to pass out to all of his cohorts listing all of these police organizations who are all in support of this bill, and if you're not on there, that's your own fault, period. So that came directly from them yesterday morning.

So that's the update on this bill. Like I said, it was opened up for co-sponsorship yesterday afternoon, so that's a wonderful thing, and I already got a couple of commitments yesterday, so that's good.

MR. WILSON: Ready to move on?

MR. GARCIA: I have a question. Best case scenario, this bill passes on both sides and we get the dedicated account as a sub-account under DMV, is that still going to be subject to appropriations approval for the future sessions?

MR. WILSON: Yes. That's what I was saying. This bill by itself does not allocate any money to ABTPA. What it does is it set asides all the funds that we collect for the purposes, and just remember that our statute says that 50 percent may only be appropriated to
ABTPA, it doesn't limit us to one dollar, it says that
we're not supposed to get, by law, less than one dollar.
But the appropriations battle is a separate discussion.
We're asking for more than a dollar in this particular
year because we are asking for $26 million. That's what
we need to expand to the level that we can reduce auto
theft and burglary in Texas.

MR. HANSEN: What this does, though, it puts it
into an account with our name on it versus the big black
hole.

MR. WILSON: Right, exactly.

MR. HANSEN: Is that the best way to put that?

So it makes it more recognizable. And it is amazing,
even as of a few weeks ago, even the speaker of the House
was not aware of where our money came from. They just
thought it came out of general revenue. They weren't
aware of how it got to general revenue from the insurance
policies. So we've still got a lot of education to do.
He knows now, but he didn't know then. So this is where
it's important that they understand.

But by creating this account, it at least
recognizes that that is an account and we are our own
resource for funds, self-funded, so to speak. So that
clarifies that for our money going into the big black hole
of general revenue and then trying to get it back out of
there. This way it goes to this account and we get it out of that, so it makes it more recognizable where it stays in our own backyard, so to speak. I think it's a key place for us for the future, whatever monies we get, to make sure that we can secure those funds.

MR. GARCIA: 4.D now.

MR. WILSON: The only thing I want to call your attention to is on page 37, we've provided you the link, I believe we've already sent it out to you, but this is the two cover letters that Chief Garcia wrote to the legislative leadership for our statutorily required plan of operation that was turned in on December 1. We'll be giving that out to other members and I know the task force commanders have already received copies and it's on our website.

MR. GARCIA: Agenda item 5, discussion and possible action about coordinating with the Insurance Council of Texas for education marketing.

MR. WILSON: We have been working with the Insurance Council of Texas. I see Mark Hanna is here from the Insurance Council of Texas. Mark, if you don't mind waving so they know who you are.

The Insurance Council of Texas is an association of Texas insurance companies that promote all kinds of things. I put some examples that Mark was kind
enough to give you. They're currently doing, and I know
El Paso and Lubbock have recently been beneficiaries of
their Lock, Take and Hide program that they've been
running for several years, and there's some examples of
effort that they do. They're out to alarm all of Texas --
is that right, Mark -- by doing smoke alarms and smoke
detectors and different fire safety things. We've got the
hurricane tour. They do a lot of big events.

Mr. Reynolds and Chief Garcia and I and Mr.
Richards went to Colorado. There's on page 48 an example
where Colorado relied on their insurance council to assist
them on promotional items and promoting keeping people
with their things intact, as you will. One of the things
that NICB just released was a report that said Texas is
number two in the nation for the number of vehicles stolen
with the keys in them. And so part of our statutory
mandate is to develop processes for informing the public
on how to keep from having their cars stolen or their
things stolen.

So what I'm asking today is just to be able to
have some ability to enter into discussions with the
Insurance Council of Texas to look at some possible
arrangements, whether grant funding or through contracted
service or cooperative agreement, or something like that.
So we want to explore those options and I just want the
board to be okay with me having those discussions about how we might work together to promote our mutual interests.

MR. GARCIA: This is an action item. Any discussion by the board members before we do a motion and a second?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Need a motion and a second.

MR. HANSEN: I make a motion that we explore this with the Insurance Council of Texas.

MR. GARCIA: We have a motion by Board Member Hansen.

MR. ROSS: Second it.

MR. GARCIA: Second by Board Member Ross. Any additional discussion?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: There is none. All in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. GARCIA: All opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GARCIA: Motion carries.

At this time we're going to adjourn for at least a five-minute recess so that I can excuse myself, and Board Member Reynolds will call you back into session.
as soon as he's ready. So thank you for attending today, and again, my apologies for having to leave early today. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:25 a.m., a brief recess was taken.)

MR. REYNOLDS: It's 10:38 and we'll go ahead and reconvene. All board members are present with the exception of Chief Garcia.

We'll go ahead and go to item number 6, page 50 in your book, motor vehicle theft investigator training updates, including authorization of travel and support funds. Bryan.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. This is Bryan Wilson, for the record.

I just wanted to update you, we started a motor vehicle theft training committee. The core partners in this effort are Texas DMV, Texas DPS, TAVTI, and of course, ABTPA staff are heavily involved, and NICB. So based on that, we set up a training committee a few months ago, we've got the curriculum approved through the Texas DMV TCOLE training advisory committee, and so now we're ready to begin doing the details of providing this training around the state. We're working through the details of the locations.

But just as a cover, I just wanted to make sure
that we had some resources allocated. I could probably do this out of my slush fund -- I'm just kidding, I'm joking, I'm joking.

(General laughter.)

MR. WILSON: But I could do it out of our budget, but I think it would just be better for the board to just go ahead and sign off on authorization for up to $20,000. I don't think I'll use very much or hardly any this year, but I think it's good to get in the practice as we move forward on this training that we develop methods to do resources. We're going to run it a couple of times, we're going to get together, see whether there's a better way to do it or maybe we should have some other kind of infrastructure, a grant, some other kind of arrangement.

But the first training is planned in about the third week of April in Houston. It will be hosted by both Houston Police Department and the Harris County Sheriff's Office. Thank you very much for that. Certainly we wanted it earlier in the year but it's been a big undertaking and it takes a lot of resources. People have full-time jobs already and we're asking a lot of the people that are doing this, but I think we're going to end up with a really good product. Like I said, the curriculum is approved.

Part of this $20,000 will be for if somebody
needs travel money reimbursed, if they need printing costs. We're going to try to do most of it electronically but we might also go ahead and authorize the disks or the jump drives or whatever we're going to do to make sure that people have the resources. And then other things might be there's been talk with several of the stakeholders about maybe a starter kit for motor vehicle theft investigators.

And one other thing on the training, NICB has cleared the training, so anybody who completes this training will have direct ISO and S-VIN access as a result of completing this training. So all the pieces are in place, so we just need to start doing the training now.

And so anyway, I'd like the board to go ahead and set aside some funds for me to support this effort going forward, and like I said, the top end is $20,000 but I don't think I need that much, I just want to make sure that I have that available in the future. But that's just for this fiscal year.

MR. REYNOLDS: Do we have any discussion, board members?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: This is an action item so it will require a motion and a second. Do I have a motion?

MR. HANSEN: Motion that we approve the funds.
MR. REYNOLDS: Do I have a second?

MR. MIZANI: Second.

MR. REYNOLDS: We have a motion to approve by Member Hansen and a second by Member Mizani. All those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. REYNOLDS: All those opposed?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Motion carries.

The next item is item number 7, page 53 of your handout, report and update on ABTPA operational guide.

MR. WILSON: As a result of the redesign and much of our response to the internal audit report from 2014 was that we were going to do a much better job of keeping up our operational processes, both internally as well as the grant administrative manual.

My recollection, in looking back at the board packets, is that going forward you actually took a vote to authorize the operational guide which is what staff uses to how we operate internally, and the grant administrative manual is what you vote on on how we will manage the funds and the grant rules and conditions by which we operate with the grantees. And so we did not have a section on insurance collection and refunds that we wanted to document. We try to document all of our processes so
everything is open and disclosable to internal audit in the future or DMV management or to this board, and so we have written, or Dan has taken the time to write this new section on how we will collect funds and then also how we will provide refunds and do analysis of refunds in the future.

So I don't need you to vote on it, I just wanted to acknowledge this to you that we're continuing this work, and as we get more and more sections, we'll continue to tell you about it and give you the opportunity to read over them and protest and confirm or cuss or discuss.

MR. REYNOLDS: Do we have any discussion regarding this item?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. We'll go ahead and move forward. We've already taken care of the committee appointments, so the next item is number 9, insurance collection update for auto theft fee. Director Wilson.

MR. WILSON: So on the insurance collection, what I had reported earlier that it had come to our attention that not all insurance companies were paying, it had come to our attention that there were some holes in the notifications in the comptroller's processes. Even though this was under contract, I think I might have told
you last meeting that there was this funny little clause
in the previous contract that Mr. Richards and I noted
when we were updating it. It said under the terms of this
condition, you will notify the ABTPA or DMV about any
agencies that didn't pay the fee, but then on the
attachment A it says they're under no obligation to notify
Texas DMV of anybody who didn't pay. And we were like,
well, that doesn't make any sense, you've just added an
attachment that contradicts the contract.

We finally got that removed, and guess what, we
got a list of -- Dan, what was it, 106 companies that had
never filed. We sent out letters I told you about last
meeting. Many of them were malpractice insurance or other
kinds of property casualty insurers. They quickly
notified us or filed a zero sum report. But we had some
questions and we had some returns on mail and things like
that. We confirmed that they are registered in the State
of Texas to sell insurance.

So we're working with the comptroller, we'll go
back in the next two weeks to get a list of companies who
still haven't filed the 2016 report -- 2015, and then
we'll send out certified letters. The first just went out
as a friendly reminder saying: Hey, we noticed you didn't
submit the money that you're supposed to pay or file a
report saying you don't owe us anything. And so now we're
going to send out a certified letter to those remaining companies after we get a new list from the comptroller. Along with that, we are working with TDI and the comptroller to examine the maintenance tax reports and the vehicles in force report to the TDI to verify that the entities that have filed reports have paid somewhere near their correct amount. So we have multiple agencies that looks like they filed a zero report, but all indications that they're claiming millions of dollars of policies premiums for vehicles that they sold.

So we're going to continue looking at that. As I told Chief Garcia a few weeks ago, we're moving slowly. Thank you earlier for volunteering or being appointed on this committee. I hope to have an Insurance Committee meeting before we get into any deep waters and we'll be getting some advice on how to move forward based on responses.

So far the responses have not been particularly negative. People have filed their reports, they've corrected their actions. I'll give you a report later whether we've collected more money. Because this hasn't been done for many, many years, if at all, we're proceeding slowly, deliberately, with caution. We are mainly a grant organization but this board has the authority to collect fees and I'm helping to make sure
your interests are well represented in the other organizations that we deal with in collecting these fees, and I'll keep you apprised as we move forward.

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Bryan.

Do we have any discussion from board members or anyone else on this item?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: We'll go ahead next to item number 10, the director's report. Bryan and staff.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. For the record, this I Bryan Wilson.

On page 63 is our current budget. We wanted to call your attention that for a little bit longer we'll be running the '16 and '17 budget, probably one more time this spring, and as you know, any budget that has ongoing activity, we still have some payments that are yet to be made out of 2016, when the majority of that gets made or whatever obligations we have, there could be some minor obligations and we'll put it as a footnote to the '17 budget. But as always, give me any input that you have.

You can see that in AY16 -- I guess these are a little bit backwards, the one on the bottom is '16, and so that is it looks like we have available budget of $1.25-, but please remember that this board in the awards meeting in May, you obligated $800,000 of this money going forward
into the current AY17. So the breakdown is that we're going to end up with about $290,000, give or take -- we're still finalizing a couple of payments -- in lapsed funds for this year. So it's a very small percentage, it's not bad but I'd sure like to get it lower. But because we obligated $800,000, that $1.4- that you see there, plus the $1.25-, we'll end up spending most of that so we're glad for that.

In '17 it's still real early, we haven't made the first quarter payments. They'll probably go out this week or early next week, but it's really not much to see yet.

I do want to call out, we've got Sheila here with us -- Sheila, can you wave -- that's our new budget analyst with Texas DMV, and we appreciate her work in preparing these budgets. This comes directly from the Uniform Account Systems and CAPPS that we currently use.

Are there any questions about the budget?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. We can go ahead and move on to 10.B, grant activities and analysis.

MR. WILSON: I'll call on Mary Dominguez.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: On page 65 you'll see a snapshot of the summary of the statewide statutory requirements reported by the grant recipients. And if you
notice, don't put too much emphasis on the negative numbers, it's still early in the grant cycle so you'll see these numbers go up.

Below we have selected three very different examples of what the grantees are doing to reduce automobile burglary and theft. The first one which is Victoria, they started the report card program which is a new initiative for them, and they have received very good reviews based on their output. Galveston, they broke up a fraudulent credit card ring, and they were using these credit cards to rent vehicles and then weren't turning them in and they were considered stolen. And then we have Lubbock, and Lubbock initiated a parking lot sign initiative, Lock, Take and Hide, and the signs were placed in parking lots. So there are many types of initiatives that the grantees do, we just wanted to give you an example of just a few.

Does anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Turning to page 67, we have a snapshot of the grantee grant adjustments summary, and we've had two so far this grant cycle.

Does anybody have any questions?

MR. HANSEN: How much has that been reduced
over previous years at this point in time, our grant
adjustment requests?

MR. WILSON: We could get 20 a quarter. We
have reduced it.

MR. HANSEN: So it's been reduced quite a bit.

MR. WILSON: Tremendously, yes.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: We have streamlined it.

MR. WILSON: And I think what this really says
is some of the changes we've made in the grantees
administrative manual, grantees are actually empowered to
just do what they're supposed to do, to put in operations
and police work and then shift money around. Again, the
board has already set by rule 5 percent. You don't need
to come ask Bryan every time you need a paper clip or a
new ink cartridge. That's something that if it's
reasonable and necessary, they should have exclusive --
and I do mean that, exclusive discretion on handling their
own finances within their governmental bodies. They
already have a city council or a commissioners court to
make sure that if there's a rule, that they follow it.

So thank you for pointing that out, Member
Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: Well, this came up because, again,
we're hearing back in the past some feedback complaints to
police administrators from your budget people, and this is
just an example of an attempt to streamline some of these processes to eliminate some of those headaches that jumps back on them as well. That's all. Thank you.

MR. REYNOLDS: Item number 10.D, educational programs and marketing.

MR. GONZALES: Good morning. My name is Dominic Gonzales. I'm a grant coordinator for ABTPA.

The document on page 69 is actually an item that you reviewed at the last board meeting, but we've made some updates based on some of the commentary that came from the board in terms of the size of the course and how we would distribute potential material. We are seeking to contract with a HUB vendor and we have sent this along to Texas DMV purchasing and they have instructed us to submit a requisition for this. This is simply an update on this.

Aside from that, we've reinitiated our activities with the Texas Crime Prevention Association, and I attended their midwinter meeting in Kerrville and gave a presentation to their board, and they are looking forward to working with us down the line in supporting the legislative agenda that ABTPA is pursuing for this legislative session.

That's all I have at this moment.

MR. REYNOLDS: All right. Thank you.
Item 10.E, agency operations.

MR. WILSON: Just wanted to update you on some of the presentations that we've been conducting. Both Mary and Dominic attended the conference at TAVTI; Dominic did a presentation. We had the executive discussion on October 24 with Chief Garcia and the task force commanders. I thought that was very fruitful and successful, and ended up in the stuff that you voted on earlier, those suggestions and information that we presented. And then we had a NICB school training course at South Padre that Dominic presented at. So we're continuing to both train staff as well as get out and do training for other jurisdictions every chance we get.

I saw Lawrence Williams was here earlier. We received the fourth quarter year-end summary. They go into the prison units, they find people with motor vehicle theft or motor vehicle burglary, they interview them. I sent that material out to the task force commanders for them to review and then provide updates to the survey.

It's incredible. I spent eight years in corrections, and it's incredible, people will actually tell you the truth when they're locked up, not everybody but many of them will, and so that's a good time when they're sitting in prison and ask them a question. So we're trying to hone in on that to provide feedback to the
commanders about some of the things that they can use in their investigations when they're looking for suspects or particular methods or modes of operation. And then, of course, Lawrence with Fuginet at TDCJ has digitized the report, and from now on we'll be sending that every quarter to the commanders in electronic format so they can review it and use it at their discretion.

So I feel that the contract is working pretty well. We've expanded our reach beyond just our grantees to other jurisdictions. They've gone out to different jurisdictions that aren't ABTPA grantees, as well as ones that are, to conduct operations to round up parolees where we have spikes in auto theft or burglaries.

Are there any questions about that?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. Moving on to item 10.F, personnel updates.

MR. WILSON: None to report, no changes.

MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. Then we'll move on to 10.G, monitoring.

MR. PRICE: This is Dan Price. I'm the ABTPA grant auditor, and this area is my primary responsibility. In the past year we have touched a total of 16 grantees. We've been on their premises and sat down with them and reviewed their operations to some extent. We
break these down into what we call monitoring visits and site visits. Site visits are much more informal, they are intended more for us to understand their operation and the issues that are impacting them. The monitoring visits are compliance reviews to ensure that they are doing what is expected under the grant.

It's a very iterative process for the monitoring visits. We'll go out and initially do our initial field work. We'll come back, we will sit down as a team, review those notes. We will send it to the grantee to make sure there were no misunderstandings or anything that was misinterpreted during the time and what our initial findings are. They will have an opportunity to give us feedback as to if we did miss something or didn't understand something. We'll then publish a final report.

Once the final report is published, we give them an opportunity to create a corrective action plan on how they're going to address these issues. They then submit that back to us, we review that to makes sure that we feel that those actions will address the issues, and then once that's approved it goes back to them to complete the work. And then the next time we come and visit them, which may be a year or two later, we'll go and verify that in fact those steps have been taken.
So that's kind of the process that we go through on this and it's been very educational for everybody. We've learned an awful lot about what our grantees face in the real world out there on the street, and they've learned a lot about what we're looking for as grant administrators. So it's been a very productive effort.

Any questions on that type of monitoring?

(No response.)

MR. PRICE: Okay. I'm going to turn the page.

The other monitoring that I do and I'm responsible for is reviewing expense reports. We have one grantee in Q-4 that is still under review. They have supplied additional information and we're reviewing it at this time.

The total payments we expect to make -- there's one remaining, again -- for Q-4, about $3.9 million. Five grantees of the 24 were approved for payment on the first review, which is up from four the previous quarter. Five grantees wound up missing their annual committed match at year-end. Three of those were considered minimal, just a small amount; two of them missed between 5 and 7.5 percent. Those folks are required to submit an explanation of why that match was missed, and then that's forwarded to the director to review and determine whether the reasoning was sufficient or whether some type of
action needs to be taken.

Fourteen grantees, the good news is the amounts initially requested were ultimately paid at the same level as the initial request, so either they were paid on the first pass, those five -- I'm going to talk in a minute about sufficiency -- they may have been deemed sufficient as opposed to perfectly accurate, or they had some type of administrative issue with it. He talked about needing a signed form earlier, if somebody isn't certified that this is true and correct, we won't accept it, that type of thing.

For ten grantees we did ask them to go back and amend the amounts on the reports. Some of these were done of their own volition, two or three of them, where they came back and said, you know what, we missed something, we've had a sub-grantee that has submitted additional bills that we were unaware of, those types of things. But ten grantees required amendment of their documentation and they did change the amounts that were being impacted on their expenditure reports.

The dollar amounts are on the table on the bottom of page 75, so there were amendments between the initial submission and what was finally paid at this point of $419,783.48. We have one to go. And that equals about 10 percent of the amount that was requested during the
quarter which is a lot more than we would hope, but we are improving.

In Q-4, one change in our process was we run across a number of instances where the grantee has made a mistake or hasn't been able to account due to the complexity of the matching that we talked about earlier. They may have made a calculation error or their books aren't able to reflect the cash match, and so they have to go back and recalculate it manually. And so in those instances if we identify a grantee has under-billed the state or the mistake is in the state's favor, we go back to that grantee and we say: Hey, we think we owe you more money, we think you have more cash match coming, would you please consider amending your report?

And in this quarter we had four of the grantees who said, Thank you very much for letting us know that, we either made a conscious choice to do that or we don't have the bandwidth to go back and adjust it, the adjustment is immaterial to us, and please process the payment as is. And we've allowed them to do that as long as we have an assurance that any non-consistency with the grant award is in the state's favor, just to reduce the administrative burden on the grantee if we're certain that they're aware of the issue.

And I guess that's it for the monitoring
reports. Are there any questions about that?

(No response.)

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you very much.

Before we move forward, Member Hansen has asked that we revisit item number 2.A, issue for current and future funding cycles.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.

Going back to the continued/modified/new grant thing, first off, I'd like to start off with a request. If you have a question, a complaint, and -- doubtful -- a compliment about something that's on the agenda, sign up to speak, please. Don't be afraid to do so. We all get dressed the same way every day and we're all in this together, this is a team effort. But if you have a question or issue with something, I can assure you somebody else in this room has the same question. But unfortunately, by the rules that we have to go by, and you will surely police us on, we're limited to what we can do unless you sign up for something.

And then I heard the comment about, well, I don't want to get up there and at three minutes get shut off -- like happened to me. I get that, I get that. But if there's dialogue going on, as you saw when Richard got up earlier, that went far longer than three minutes. So if you have a question or something that we're going to
have to respond to or Mr. Wilson is going to have to respond to, don't think that in three minutes I'm going to stop talking or he's going to stop talking. We're going to address what you want, but you have to bring it up.

But the question came up, and I want to clarify this, and if I'm wrong on this, I want to know. If you have a current grant but you want to add to your program, whether it be a new program, additional jurisdictions, or you had a project that you did but you lost it because of staff losses and cuts or whatever in the past but this is a viable thing that you want that you think you need to do in your area over and above what you're doing today, to either bring back or move forward or expand your program to adjust problems, that's what the modified grant is about. Am I correct?

MR. WILSON: That's correct.

MR. HANSEN: Which basically means that you will do two applications: what you have today minus give or take 5 percent, and anything over that, obviously if you're asking for personnel or equipment or whatever it is to make up a deficit or something in the past or for the future, this is where you apply for it. No guarantee you're going to get it, I'm not going to stand up here and say that, but this is where you need to apply.

So you can do two applications, and we talked
about this streamlines the process so if there is
questions about that, it doesn't interfere and get
convoluted with your operations that you're running today.
And I wanted to clarify that, that you are going to be
eligible to do two applications for concurrent and in
addition to.

That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. We can go ahead and move
on to the next item, 11, executive session. It's my
understanding there's no executive session today, so we
can move on to item number 13, adjournment, and I'll need
a motion for adjournment.

MS. HUNTER: I move that we adjourn.

MR. REYNOLDS: Do I have a second?

MR. MIZANI: Second.

MR. REYNOLDS: Bryan, real quick, do we know
when the next meeting may be, or do we have any dates
we're looking at?

MR. WILSON: Not yet, but I would love for you
to tell Mary Beth whatever dates, however you want to do
it, if you want to tell her when you're not going to be
available.

MR. HANSEN: If we could maybe get from you all
the time windows that we normally run, give or take a week
or two.
MR. WILSON: Okay. We'll need another meeting in May, based on what you voted on earlier with the scoring, because right now the planned date for the grant application due date is going to be around May 19, somewhere in there, so we'll need to consider the scoring mechanism somewhere around that time frame.

MR. HANSEN: All right. And then we could schedule too for the rest of the year out, because people have vacations and conferences and training, and we want to run either in conjunction with those or not opposite of those.

MR. WILSON: Right. And based on that, we need something in early May and late June, if you could give us possible dates for your schedules in that time frame. We'll do the scoring in May, it could be in late April, but I'm just giving you a window, and then we need to do awards probably by the end of June or the first week in July.

MR. REYNOLDS: All right. Thank you all for being here and have a safe trip back home.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.)
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