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MR. HANSEN: Good morning, everybody. Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. HANSEN: All right. I know it’s a long day.

My name is Tommy Hansen. I’m pleased to open the board meeting for the Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention Authority. It is 9:00 a.m. straight up.

I’m now calling the board meeting for January 10 to order. 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 the Secretary of State on January 2, 2019.

Before we begin today’s meeting -- and I'm going to make sure mine is off -- everybody please mute your phones in the silent mode.

If you wish to address the Board at today's meeting, please complete a speaker's card at the registration tables up front. To comment on an agenda item you'll need to fill out the yellow ones, and if you want to do public comment, fill out the other forms that are up there.

I'd like to first do roll call. Member Hunter?

MS. HUNTER: Present.
MR. HANSEN: Reynolds?
(No response.)
MR. HANSEN: Mr. Gause?
MR. GAUSE: Present.
MR. HANSEN: Rodriguez?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: Present.
MR. HANSEN: Mizani?
MR. MIZANI: Present.
MR. HANSEN: And Ms. Kinney?
MS. KINNEY: Present.
MR. HANSEN: Let the record reflect that I, Tommy Hansen, am here as well. Also let the record reflect that Member Reynolds is absent today.

I'd like to start off and do the next thing is to do some introductions here. We have two new members of the Board, and of course, as you all know, I was given the responsibility or duties -- we'll see if that's still what it is after we're done today -- as Board chairman.

I'd like to introduce Mr. Gause, our insurance representative. Shay brings a lot to the table for us. He is with SIU, with USAA Insurance and also has a law enforcement background, which is good.

Do you have anything you'd like to add to that?

MR. GAUSE: I appreciate the opportunity.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. And then our next one is
Mr. Rodriguez new to the Board, Mike. Most of y'all know Mike. Mike has been involved with the Laredo Task Force and with our program for many, many years.

And I think both of these guys are going to be tremendous, tremendous assets to our goals and objectives of what we plan to do for the future of this organization.

MR. HANSEN: All right. Moving along here.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Chairman.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir, Mike. I'm sorry.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Chairman Hansen and members of the Board, thank you. I'm honored for the trust and confidence that the governor has invested in me by appointing me to this Board.

And to the task forces, all of you, I'm committed to each and every one without reservation and I will work tirelessly to champion the cause of this authority with its mission and to strengthen and secure its future.

Now, I'm from Laredo, as most of you already know. Some of the problems that we have with auto theft in Laredo reflect a lot with the problems that El Paso, Eagle Pass and the Valley has, but I'm also aware and I'm also concerned of the issues in North Texas, that Dallas and Houston and San Antonio are having, and I'm going to take all of that into consideration when all of you apply
for new grants and for new monies. So I'm very aware of the issues that we all have and I'm here to help you and I'm going to promise you that I'm going to meet with each and every one of you to see what the needs are and where we can make it better and become a better team.

Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Before we do the next thing, I'd like to comment. Normally we'll have public comment at the beginning but it seems like sometimes conversation will come up throughout the meeting that will generate someone wanting to make public comment so we have moved it to later in the agenda, however, if there is someone here that has something urgent and has to leave, let me know, but we have nothing else for public comment. But we have moved it to the end so as the meeting progresses and there's something that you want to bring up that you think needs to be discussed at a later date or for the committees in public comment, please fill out a form and we'll handle that near the end of the agenda.

I'd like to seek approval of the transcript as the minutes of the meeting from May 23, 2018.

MS. KINNEY: Mr. Chairman, this is Linda Kinney, and I'd like to make a motion to adopt the transcript as minutes from the May 23, 2018 board meeting

MR. HANSEN: Do we have a second?
MS. HUNTER: I second the motion.

MR. HANSEN: Ms. Hunter seconds.

A motion has been made, seconded to adopt the transcript as the minutes of May 23, 2018. Is there any discussion further on that?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Hearing none, we'll call for a vote. All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes adopting the transcript as the minutes. Okay. That's done.

Further comments and recognition from the Board. Do any of the Board members, Ms. Hunter, do you have anything you want to bring up to the group, you'd like to address?

MS. HUNTER: No. Do I?

MR. HANSEN: No. I just wondered if you have any comments you'd like to make.

MS. HUNTER: No. I'm fine.

MR. HANSEN: Linda?

MS. KINNEY: I'm fine. Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: You're fine.

Armin?
MR. MIZANI: I'm fine. Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.

I just have a comment I'd like to make as your new chair. Some of you already read this, I sent some of you an email, but this kind of goes in line with what Mike said.

I want to start by giving thanks to all of you for your support. As you know, I've been blessed by Governor Abbott to be appointed as Board chair. These are big shoes to fill as Chief Garcia has been a supporter of ABTPA for decades. Since I've been involved with ABTPA, starting as a dream in 1989, the opportunity to work with each of you and take this organization into the future is truly an honor for me.

The governor also presented us with two new Board members, Mike Rodriguez as law enforcement and Shay Gause as new insurance rep. Both bring a lot to the table in dedication and experience. Most of you have worked with Mike and his task force and their accomplishments speak loudly about his dedication to his program. Also, Shay has tremendous insurance, SIU experience and a law enforcement background and came highly recommended to us by the National Insurance Crime Bureau.

The new year and the new legislative session will bring many new challenges, as always, however, the
current recommendation from the LBB and the report from
the Sunset Commission concerning ABTPA were both extremely
favorable for us. However, we'll still need to work as a
team and move forward to enhance our program for law
enforcement and the citizens of Texas. As stated, we are
a team, everyone in this room. What has made this program
so successful is that from Beaumont to El Paso and from
Amarillo to Brownsville we have all worked as one.

I'm asking that if you have any questions,
comments, compliments or complaints about anything on the
agenda, please sign up and speak on these agenda items.
If you have some ideas on other matters, please sign up
for public comment. If we don't communicate during these
meetings, it's hard for us to move forward as the team
that we are. I want to create working committees with
your involvement to help us all work together. We also
have a great Board that is wanting to move forward and the
ABTPA staff are great, and again, I'd like to say we are a
team. And that's my comment where that's concerned.

The next thing I'd like to discuss, the
governor also issued a recognition for Watch Your Car
Month to encourage all Texans to take necessary steps and
precautions to reduce motor vehicle burglaries and thefts
throughout Texas. The proclamation was an important tool
in generating local recognition for the work of the ABTPA.
Also, during today's meeting we will recognize the service of two Board members, as well as the retirement of at least two officers who have served the task forces around the state. We will also recognize various task force personnel who made it possible to provide investigator training throughout the year.

The Board will also consider items related to the administration of the ABTPA, including matters related to collections from insurance companies, budget matters from 2018 and beyond, and the issuance and request for applications for future grants. We're going to discuss that at length today.

Beyond all of this, we will discuss the 86th Legislative Session which began this week, actually. We will discuss conclusions of the Sunset review process and the impact it may have on us during the upcoming session.

On our former Board members, we'd like to recognize Chief Carlos Garcia, who is not here today, as well as Mr. Ken Ross, an insurance representative on the Board. Is Ken here today? No.

We're going to get with them both and we have some presentations and we're going to handle them directly at a later date.

Ken served with us for a number of years, but Carlos was involved in this program pretty much from the
very beginning, as I was, way back when he was with
Brownsville Police Department for many years, and we want
to give tremendous kudos to him and his work. And if you
guys down south see him, be sure and give him a big thank
you.

Congratulations on some retirements. From
Dallas County North Texas Task Force, Stephen Smith. Is
Stephen here today? No.

And John Bailey with Sheriff's Combined Task
Force. I know John is here somewhere. John, raise your
hand. All right. If you don't know John, you need to.

And then some commendations, congratulations,
just some notes that were passed on to us as far as those
that helped tremendously with some of the training that
was done this year. As you know, that was passed on to us
as a new responsibility and it was taken on tremendously.

In San Marcos we've got Robert Curbelo, Ryan
MyCue, Brian Johns, Michael Andaloro, Carl Olavesen,
Herman Adair, Joe Joines and Ryan Williams. We're going
to get some certificates for them. Appreciate what they
have done.

Also, we're going to recognize the companies
that supported us in some of this training: Copart in San
Antonio, Copart in New Braunfels, Ritchie Brothers
Auctioneers in Lake Worth, and of course, Archie and Geoff
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with NICB, and the Texas Department of Public Safety, and we have certificates for all of those.

So if you're part of any of these groups that we just mentioned, after the meeting if you'll come up so we can get you a certificate so you can pass it on to your guys.

Moving on, Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Well, actually this is one you can do on your own, but I can lay it out if you'd like.

MR. HANSEN: That's fine.

MR. WILSON: This is Bryan Wilson for the record.

The next issue before the Board is actually a chair prerogative, I don't think it requires an action item or a vote, but I wanted to lay out, been able to reach out to most of you but I lost a day this week so I didn't get all my phone calls made. The Board in the last, I don't know, year and a half has had standing committees and they have specific charges to those committees. And I did call the new members to verify that they would serve in the role on this committee, but otherwise, unless there's an objection for any one of the members, we'll proceed with the chair to appoint these committees as well as appoint the chair for each committee.
And just for the record, there's three committees. There's one committee called the Grants, Budget and Reports Committee, and the name speaks for itself as to what it does. The Insurance Collections and Refund Committee which, again, the proposed chair is Armin Mizani, Ashley Hunter and Shay Gause on that committee to deal with collections and refunds. And then the Education and Legislative Committee with proposed Linda Kinney as chair, and Shay Gause and Mike Rodriguez to assist in that capacity. And going back real quick to the Grants, Budget and Reports Committee, that would be Mike Rodriguez chair, and then Wynn Reynolds and Ashley Hunter as the members.

MR. HANSEN: On that one, it appears that there's probably going to be a change with Mr. Reynolds. We met with DPS yesterday. We can't officially release anything because it's not been finalized, but there's probably going to be a new member from DPS coming on, and if it's who was discussed yesterday, it's wonderful for everybody involved. So we'll announce that as soon as the documents are signed with DPS and we can move forward with that.

Are all the members okay with serving on these capacities on these boards? Everybody good?

(General agreement from Board members.)

MR. HANSEN: All right. Fantastic.
With no objections to that, we're going to move forward, but we're going to accept as recommended on page 21 of 22 to accept these positions, the Board members assigned to these positions.

Moving on, agenda item number 3. This is discuss and consider FY 2018 post-award grant adjustments for the City of Houston and the City of Corpus Christi.

MR. WILSON: I'll go ahead and lay it out, Mr. Chairman.

So this is an action necessary for the Board to consider. Typically the grant RFA and the grant rules control what activity takes place within the grants. We follow those rules, as well as some state law and state guidance, published rules by the Comptroller.

One of the things that the director typically does throughout the year, and we always report back to the Board, is what's called grant adjustments, and you'll see it when we get to the report later, in the reporting section we'll tell you these are all the grant adjustments we did, whether they were budget or program or whatever. So a few weeks ago, I think it was Montgomery County, for instance, as a program adjustment they added Angelina County to their coverage network. Well, that's not in the grant statement, it doesn't have a major impact on the operation of the program but because the grant is a
contract, we have to acknowledge that and grant the grant adjustment. They request it and then we provide it, so that's just a simple example of a program adjustment.

Other things is somebody will leave, they'll have what we call lapsed salary where somebody left and it takes a while to get them replaced, so now they have money, they might want to buy a truck or they need to buy LPRs or they need to buy supplies with that money. It's still for the operation of the program, nobody can do anything other than what the program is.

So in this case, one of the terms that the director has is to only be able to grant budget adjustments within the term. If it's outside the term, then there's no authorization for the director under state law to grant that exception. In this case we have a request from the City of Houston for their grant. They had a lapsed salary of roughly $30,000. They spent it for what we would consider reasonable and allowable. In other words, if this grant adjustment request had come in during the term of the grant, I would have granted it, but because it involved overtime and the Board has set rules around overtime as a highly restrictive issue -- overtime and equipment are the two controlled features of our grant that the Board has more say than most of the other categories.
So in this case the City of Houston spent some funds that were above and beyond what they were authorized to do. In the grant adjustment on page 26 their stated reason is that they misunderstood -- we have what's called a 5 percent flexibility rule and they thought it applied to overtime and it didn't. And so based on that explanation and their understanding that going forward that they full understand that overtime is a controlled category within the grant, that they would go ahead and request that we approve the grant adjustment and that would authorize the ABTPA director to make the final payment. The final payment is on page 25, the budget adjustment that you're approving is on page 26.

So are there any questions?

MR. HANSEN: Before we move forward, we have Naquin and Capt. Bennett from Houston PD signed up. Do y'all want to come up and anything you want to say on this?

CAPT. BENNETT: Good morning, Bryan Bennett, Houston PD, and Lt. Kye Naquin, Houston Police Department.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir.

CAPT. BENNETT: So recently I took over the grants for the Houston Police Department. Once I took over, it was brought to my attention about this grant adjustment, so basically I made contact, I read everything
that was written, and made contact with the previous
lieutenant. And just as Mr. Wilson stated, the lieutenant
said that we had some extra money because the previous
lieutenant went to the FBI Academy and another sergeant
went to Puerto Rico after the hurricane, they had some
excess salary money, and so they were under the impression
that it was under the 5 percent rule and so it was brought
to their attention that it wasn't, and so this grant
adjustment was requested. And going forward, we realize
that it has to be done in advance for overtime.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. Any other comment?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much.

MR. MIZANI: Question for Bryan. Is this the
first time the City of Houston has made this?

MR. WILSON: Things happen over years but they
haven't had this kind of exception or problem in quite
some time or beyond my memory of two or three years.

MR. MIZANI: All right.

MR. HANSEN: And in conjunction with that, I
spoke with Lieutenant Hardin about this, he called me and
we discussed it, and you know, along with your
conversation, by no means is Houston PD any kind of a
problem child for us on any matter, so it happened.

MR. MIZANI: I'm from Dallas so I don't know
about that.

MR. WILSON: Well said, sir.

MR. HANSEN: All righty.

(General laughter.)

MR. GAUSE: Mr. Wilson, when would it typically have been filed to be within your authority?

MR. WILSON: Before August 31, even until midnight August 31. I mean, if at any point we would have realized that they were allocating those funds, we would have said, Hey, do a budget adjustment. I knew that the commander -- matter of fact, I was the one who said, Oh, you're leaving for the FBI Academy, remember you have to go off the grant. So in some essence, I created at least part of the money that they had available but it didn't occur to me come back later to say -- because, again, normally they have the 5 percent rule so if they would have bought supplies, printer ink cartridges, paperclips, if they would have bought that, they would have never asked me, they would never communicated with me.

It's just equipment and overtime, by rule and pretty much by state law -- I mean, there's some other principles in the grant management principles that set -- controlled assets is what we call equipment at the state level and then overtime is by board rule. There's nothing really that would cause that other than our agency's own
adopted rules about overtime control.

Just a quick primer, I don't want to take too much on this issue, but before, I believe, May or June of this year, of this last year, overtime was zero, you could move no money into overtime. I submitted and the Board approved a request to give the commanders a $1,000 flexibility. That's why some of the math doesn't perfectly work out on this thing because you're like, wait a minute, they spent 31-, what do you mean they're 28- or whatever. Well, that's because of the $1,000 exclusion.

So it's something that the Board may take up, you know, a broader exclusion for overtime, because as Naquin and Capt. Bennett and I talked about overtime, a lot of times you're in an undercover operation and it's not always something you can plan out ahead. Generally you should plan some overtime when you have those situations.

But I'll stop there and we recommend that -- I would have approved this had it been within my time frame.

CAPT. BENNETT: Also, too, just so you'll know, of that 31,000, I had one of my sergeants go back and look at what the results were for the amount of money. So we recovered 40 vehicles, six guns, 31 grams of cocaine, nine suspects placed in jail on outstanding warrants and 17 new felony charges were filed with that money.
MR. HANSEN:  Pretty good bang for the buck.
CAPT. BENNETT:  You can give us more.

(General laughter.)

MR. HANSEN:  Working on it, we're working on it.

MR. WILSON:  That's what I call icing on the cake.

MR. HANSEN:  And also, welcome aboard.
CAPT. BENNETT:  Thank you.

MR. HANSEN:  Houston PD has always been a major part of this group from day one, and welcome aboard.

Anything else?  Other comments?

MR. RODRIGUEZ:  Just real quick.  This was for one quarter or for the entire -- was it just for this operation, the overtime?

CAPT. BENNETT:  The money was spent between May 30 and August 3.

MR. WILSON:  For the overtime.

CAPT. BENNETT:  The overtime money.  Right.

MS. KINNEY:  Mr. Chairman, after hearing all of that discussion, I'd like to make a motion to authorize the final payment to the City of Houston by approving a grant adjustment for their overtime budget.

MR. RODRIGUEZ:  I second it.

MR. HANSEN:  We have a second, Mike.
A motion has been made and seconded to approve the grant adjustment for final payment to the City of Houston. Is there any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Hearing none, we'll call for a vote. All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes, and the grant adjustment will be taken care of and you'll get your money, guys.

CAPT. BENNETT: Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, very, very much.

Mr. Wilson, is it my understanding the City of Corpus Christi matter was resolved?

MR. WILSON: Yes, Chairman. We had a discussion on that that the net effect of me denying or approving the grant adjustment would have meant zero difference in the amount of payment, so I denied the request and we authorized payment to Corpus Christi for that matter.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: They got all the award that they requested.
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MR. HANSEN: Good. That's what counts.

Item number 4, discussion and consider insurance refunds.

MR. WILSON: I've asked Dan Price, the grant auditor, to lay this out for the Board, with your permission, sir. Is that okay?

MR. HANSEN: Yes.

MR. PRICE: For the record, this is Dan Price, ABTPA grant auditor.

We'll have two insurance refund requests to consider today, they will be considered separately. The first one is Elephant Insurance. Elephant submitted a request on July 23, 2018 in the amount of $35,386. In their explanation for the refund they indicated that the payment was a duplicate payment, and in fact, this is going to come up later in the board meeting, but the majority of our requests are from organizations of insurance companies where there may be various subsidiaries or related companies and one of the parent companies is making the payment and the company itself that may have either underwritten or issued the policy is making the payment. So in this instance Elephant Insurance felt that they had made the payment for Red Point and that Red Point was also making the same payment, so they were requesting a refund.
We reached out to the Comptroller's Office, who keeps the records and actually gets the remittances from the companies for ABTPA and asked them for transcripts for the payments and reports from the insurance companies in this matter. It came back that we were unable to identify a duplicate payment in this particular instance at first, so we went back to Elephant and Red Point and indicated, you know, we're unable to find in the state's records where a duplicate payment had been made. It took them a bit of time but they were actually able to give us transactional information that indicated that they had made a duplicate payment and we were able to confirm that with the Comptroller once we had the additional data.

So that being said, it is apparent that they had both filed for the same amount of money for the same period of time, and the ABTPA staff recommends that this refund be approved.

MR. GAUSE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. GAUSE: I'll abstain from this motion.

MR. HANSEN: Okay.

MS. HUNTER: Likewise.

MR. HANSEN: Ms. Hunter abstains.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to approve Elephant Insurance's request for
a refund in the amount of $35,386.

MR. HANSEN: Do we have a second on the motion?

MS. KINNEY: Second.

MR. HANSEN: Ms. Kinney.

Is there any discussion, further discussion on this?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All right. Hearing none, I'll call for a vote. All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes.

For the purpose of the folks, most of you know this but for some of the new Board members, any time this occurs like this, this money does not come out of our grant allotment money, this comes from a totally separate fund, so this is not depriving you or any of our programs out of this $35,000, so make sure you know that.

MR. MIZANI: Question for staff. Is there any way for us to identify these payments other than the insurance companies, whether it be the parent company or the sister company being the ones coming to us? Is there any way that we're keeping any track of these things or any mechanism for that?
MR. PRICE: There are actually a variety of different statistical processes that we utilize to try and identify folks who are out of bounds for what we would normally expect. The enforcement activity -- and once again, this is going to be discussed later in the meeting -- the enforcement activity is limited in our regard. We have to reach out to sister agencies, like the Texas Department of Insurance, for assistance in these matters, and that will be discussed later today. So we do have several different methods that we try and keep track of on a regular basis to identify folks who either underpaid or overpaid or a variety of different issues.

MR. MIZANI: Okay.

MR. HANSEN: The next thing is 4.B. Integon National Insurance Company.

MR. PRICE: This is Dan Price again, ABTPA grant auditor.

Integon National Insurance has been before the Board before. They had originally requested a refund in July of 2016. We had requested repeated information in support of their assertion that they were due a refund. We were unable to obtain that. So at a subsequent board meeting on November 14, 2017, we brought this before the Board and the Board actually requested that we reach out to the Comptroller for assistance in performing a review.
of an audit of this particular return, which we did.

   The documentation, the official finding is on the next page, on page 35 and 36. To briefly summarize it, it basically asserts that the information that they had requested was also not provided. They had requested sample policies, for example, so they could see the number of vehicles on the policy. That information was not provided. They asked for the method of the calculation that was used. That was provided and determined to not be consistent with state regulations. So they recommended to the director that it go before the Board with the recommendation that this request be denied.

   On page 37 and 38 there's a little bit more clarity in just the final communication between Integon and the Comptroller as to what was deficient and why that recommendation was going to be made and what the conclusions were going to be. So at this time, based on the recommendation from the Comptroller that they were unable to support the request for refund, it is the recommendation of ABTPA staff that this refund be denied.

   MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to deny the refund request of Integon National Insurance Company.

   MR. HANSEN: Okay. Do we have a second?

   MR. MIZANI: I'll second.
MR. HANSEN: A motion has been made and seconded to deny Integon's refund. I would like to note that Members Hunter and Gause have continued to abstain from this deal.

Is there any discussion?

MR. WILSON: I have one issue I'd like to make a question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Price, was Integon notified about this meeting today?

MR. PRICE: Yes, it was. It was notified in writing.

MR. WILSON: In writing through email or letter?

MR. PRICE: Through email.

MR. WILSON: Okay. And I just want to make sure that that's on the record that they were provided.

And Mr. Chairman, I'd like you to call and see if there's anybody from Integon to represent or discuss this matter, even though they haven't signed up.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, we have no sign-up sheet, but is anyone from Integon Insurance present today?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Make a note that there's no one here representing the insurance company.
MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANSEN: Any other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All those in favor of denying the Integon refund request signify by raising your hand or saying yea or nay. All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes denying the refund.

Moving along, number 5. Mr. Wilson. I think this goes in line with Mr. Mizani's question a minute ago.

MR. WILSON: Right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'll go ahead and apologize in advance. We kind of made a mistake as far as the way we organized the book. Starting on page 45 which is the response, the Board directed us November 2017 to talk to the Department of Insurance about the definition of motor vehicle. We had several people that are claiming exemptions that our rule and our forms allow, but the statute and an Attorney General opinion really doesn't authorize any type of exemption. It says motor vehicle insurance, a $2 assessment is on motor vehicle insurance.

And what my apology was for, the letter that's following on page 47, there were two issues before the
Board on the November meeting. One was what do we do with people who won't file or pay, and then the second was what is your definition of motor vehicle insurance so we can determine who owes the money. Unfortunately, I put the wrong letter in behind the response to TDI. And I think, Mary Beth, did you hand out? There should be a copy of the correct letter that talks about the six exemptions either in your board book or close to it, and it's an email from me and it states that we were asking for clarification of the definition of motor vehicle insurance.

So in response to the letter about what is motor vehicle insurance, and you'll see that the six exemptions were laid out in the TDI's, Texas Department of Insurance's letter. They said it's not a term we commonly use even though it's defined in statute. The other thing is that they went a step further and said that they didn't have any obligation to help us collect the fee, which is true and never was intimated in any of our texts or conversations or emails.

So with that response, some of the board packet that follows, we put together what we thought was going to be a response based on a conversation with the Insurance Committee members independently. I guess we didn't officially have a meeting but we talked to the two
Insurance Committee members that were on the phone call. We kind of came up with a strategy but since then we think that the better strategy is laid out in a memorandum issued by David Richards. That's also a handout, it's titled Memorandum, to the Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention members.

You know, what David, Mr. Richards did in this memo was really to lay out where we are today. It's not a pretty picture but it's just the reality through a series of rule adoptions and transfers of authority and some statutory changes and some AG opinions, and so it doesn't matter really at this point how we got here but how we go forward and fix it.

Section 12 of our enabling statute, revised civil statutes, authorizes this Board to convene an advisory committee for a term of not more than one year to set forth, to advise the committee on actions before it, and it is our proposal today that we go forward with establishing that advisory committee made up of industry stakeholders, both associations and individual insurance companies, that can provide us expertise and report back whether we should make rule changes, whether we should abandon all rules, whether we should -- you know, what actions we need to take going forward, and then help this Board to sort this whole issue out.
MR. RICHARDS: Mr. Chairman, may I?

MR. HANSEN: Yes.

MR. RICHARDS: As well as industry officials or representatives, we want a couple of Board members, we want staff from TDI and CPA as well, so it will be a well rounded group to address this issue. As I found in doing my legal research on it, it was really a high level review of not only the rulemaking process, beginning with TDI, but coming forward with the Auto Theft Prevention Authority, our predecessor, and the AG opinion, and it really created kind of a muddy picture of what was out there. So as Bryan Wilson has indicated, we have what we have, but we want to sit down with stakeholder groups and a couple of Board members and see where we go forward with the assessment fee and what we should do. But it's going to be a number of different groups, representatives from different groups that will be on this advisory committee that we're recommending.

Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Anything else?

MR. WILSON: Just going to Mr. Mizani's question a minute ago. So in this process, we've been moving forward, looking at the records of TDI, trying to match up records for -- what do they call it, motor vehicle years? Is that right, Dan? And then looking at
the Comptroller's retaliatory maintenance tax fee. What we've walked into that hasn't really been addressed by TxDOT staff over the years or people that came before us was that there's some information out there that doesn't line up and that's now we discovered these exemptions. When these people didn't file a report but they were listed as casualty insurers, we sent a note, they said, Hey, we're exempt.

And so, yes, we've been using lots of data streams to try to figure this out but we think that this Board should appoint this advisory committee to really do a wholesale revision of our business related to collections, which could include not only these exemptions but the other things that we're missing from our stakeholders at TDI or the Comptroller or whatever.

So at this point we're in a little bit of a mess. It's none of our making, and when we go forward we need it well fixed. Is that a term? I don't know.

MR. RICHARDS: We'll go with it.

MR. WILSON: So with that, we request that you establish this advisory committee.

MR. HANSEN: Motion?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion that this Board create an advisory committee consisting of Board members, members of relevant
stakeholder groups, including staff and the CPA and the TDI and insurance representatives, to review the law, rules, forms and industry practices relating to the ABTPA's collection of the statutory assessment fee.

MR. HANSEN: Do we have a second for this motion?

MS. KINNEY: Second.

MR. HANSEN: A motion has been made and seconded to create an advisory committee to review the law, rules, forms and industry practices relating to the statutory assessment fee. Is there any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Nothing from our two insurance folks?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Okay. All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: The motion passes.

Mr. Wilson, I would like to comment. Thank you very much, and Dan and everyone for the work on this.

MR. WILSON: And David.

MR. HANSEN: And David. There's a lot of
work -- for the people out here in the audience, there's a lot of work behind the scenes that goes on, and these type of topics, boring as they may be, are related to if there's people that should be paying us money, that puts more money in the pot that we can possibly get our hands on, we want to take care of that, but if we're illegally taking someone's money, we don't want to do that either. So that's what that's all about.

Moving forward, number 6.

MR. WILSON: Okay. There's a sub-part, I just want to call your attention in passing to page 53 of your board book about the discussions that I mentioned earlier with the Insurance Committee members that we'll continue -- I just wanted to kind of lay out the understanding for item number 1 that we're going to continue the enforcement on non-payers and non-filers. Now, the statute doesn't say that we can take enforcement action or notify TDI if they don't file, but if you don't file, we have no mechanism to know whether or not that insurer has paid. So we're treating them one and the same administratively and that's when I call your attention to page 56 of the board book where under the DMV contract MOU between DMV and ABTPA, the contract or the MOU outlines that this Board will adopt policy and procedures for the staff to follow and will implement that on your behalf as
DMV employees.

So this is kind of a clarification that when we have 15 or 20 individuals that we've identified as non-payers or non-filers, if we follow your process that we're proposing that you adopt today on page 56, if I do what you tell me to do, then I can go forward and notify TDI of an action. And again, as David pointed out in his memo -- I know not everybody read every detail of the memo -- we don't have the legal authority to ask TDI to revoke that license. This Board's only action, and it says shall notify TDI that they didn't pay, it does not authorize this board to say, Please revoke. And I think I've stated that in the past and that's incorrect. The only thing I can do if I follow this procedure and identify they didn't pay or they didn't file, then I notify TDI and say they didn't pay or they didn't file. I don't request any action whatsoever to be taken. And they can look at their enforcement actions. I've talked to TDI a couple of times. They say that they might be able to take an enforcement action and use this to their benefit, but again, we can't request that they revoke somebody's license, we just say, Hey, this person won't file, won't pay.

So that's what this procedure is setting forth, and as we begin -- everything we've been dealing with up
to now has been 2015, this is now 2018, so if you adopt
this procedure, then me and my staff will begin doing what
we did for '15, according to this procedure, for '16 and
'17 which are now fully paid and we have the records so
we're ready to move on, but we have been holding back
until we got an answer from TDI. So that's what's being
laid out here today, and if you adopt this procedure,
that's what we'll do and then as soon as we find somebody
after all these written certifications, notifications to
attorneys, all the activities that we've been doing to get
ahold of somebody to say please respond to us or tell us
that you have an exemption, or whatever. You know, a lot
of these guys we've found out were attorney malpractice,
they're property and casualty insurance but they're
attorney malpractice or they're medical malpractice.
Well, okay, that's all we needed to know, thank you very
much.

So anyway, that's what we're recommending, that
you adopt this procedure and then we'll implement it on
your behalf and notify TDI when anybody fails to pay or
file.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
make a motion that this Board adopt the policy and
procedures as displayed on page 56 in the board meeting
book, and I further move that the Board delegate the
authority to the ABTPA director to notify TDI when insurers fail to pay the assessment fee or fail to file the required assessment forms.

MR. HANSEN: Do I hear a second?

MR. MIZANI: I'll second.

MR. HANSEN: The motion has been made and seconded to adopt the policy and procedures displayed on page 56 of the board meeting book to authorize the director to notify TDI when insurers fail to pay the assessment fee or fees or fail to file the required assessment forms. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any against, opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes. Thank you.

Number 7, Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: This is an informational item and we're not going to be taking an action on this. I just wanted to report back to you, as this Board took action last year, I think it was the November meeting but it might have been the one before when we received the $2-1/2 million cut. This Board really stood up, recognized, you did a lot of cost-saving measures. I don't know if you
remember that. You reduced the fund balance for program
income, we cut some administrative costs out of the grant
programs and we kept all the officers that we were trying
to hold onto, the highly skilled and trained officers that
we have in these task forces, and it was tough and these
guys really stood up and we appreciate everything the
Board did.

Well, one of the things we recommended, staff
recommended is to ask the Legislative Budget Board for
unexpended balance authority which is very rare in state
government. Normally when you have an unexpended balance
it just disappears back into the general fund. This Board
made that request of the governor and the LBB, they
granted that request. We said up to $500,000. We had
estimated it was going to be around $250- or somewhere in
there. Well, it turned out it was $357,000 -- we're still
closing out some POs, but it's going to be right at
$350,000, a little bit more.

And so I just wanted to report back to both the
task forces, as well as this Board, that that was a great
opportunity that we took. It was a big risk, sometimes
these things are not met with great favor, but the
governor and the LBB both granted that request, and so
here we are today with an additional $357,000, and then
we're going to move over to the budget and talk about what
we can do now that we have these funds available for this
time period.

So, thank you, and thank you, task forces, for
stepping up and helping us with that.

MR. MIZANI: Bryan, that carryforward amount,
how does it compare to previous years?

MR. WILSON: It's right in line. The most
we've have is around $500-something, $550-, and then the
lowest we've had is $100-. I'm kind of working off of
memory for the last five years, but this is kind of right
in the middle. I mean, we had averaged the last five
years when we made the request and went a little higher
just in case for the $500,000.

MR. MIZANI: But as you noted, it's not every
year that we get that amount back.

MR. WILSON: Oh, no. This was a one-time deal
that the governor and the LBB did. We have always asked
for our budget to have unexpended balance in the biennium.
The state never grants unexpended balance across a
biennium, but it's very normal for especially grant
programs because we can't control our expenditures. These
guys have a huge penalty within their city and county
governments to come up short on their budget, they would
get chastised pretty severely. So there's always going to
be some slack there. They kind of have to build that in
to the system.

So anyway, that's kind of where we are and so we hit about where we thought we were going to hit.

MR. MIZANI: Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

Number 8.

MR. WILSON: So now that we know that information, and thank everybody for doing that, as part of the contract between ABTPA -- or MOU between ABTPA and DMV, the ABTPA Board is supposed to administer the expenses of the agency and one of the ways we have always done that is through a budget, but we didn't have any meetings in time for the budget, so I just took a risk that y'all might come back after the fact and authorize the budget for this year. We pretty much loaded in what we had the previous year. The exceptions, there's certain things in salaries.

So just wanted to go ahead and ask you to adopt the budget as it stands right now, and then we'll talk about the $357,000 separately over the next few pages. So with that, here's the budget consistent with previous years and the obligations that you made in the grants.

MR. HANSEN: We do have someone signed up to talk about this.

Richard, is this the agenda item you wanted to
bring this up on?

MR. HALE: Good morning, Board. My name is Richard Hale, sergeant for the Sheriff's Combined Auto Task Force. I'll be discussing not only the FY19 budget but the budget moving forward. So I'd like to thank you today for allowing me to speak and I'd like to acknowledge all the new Board members, all the task force members and directors that are here today.

The topics I will be discussing will not apply to all task forces represented here today, however, many are facing some of the same financial challenges. I do not intend to speak for everyone, but only offer my experiences as they relate to a 17-county multi-jurisdictional task force. Some of the topics will be caseload versus proactive units, D.O.E. expenses, and Sunset Committee recommendations.

ABTPA supports the grantees and task forces statewide across many jurisdictions. Some grantees are single agencies and others are multi-agency task forces. Regardless of the size, it is paramount to keep in mind that all are working toward the same goals and objectives. Depending on the agencies, some of the agencies do not carry a caseload but focus solely on proactive investigations and stolen vehicle interdiction, while others may carry 30 to 40 cases per month. Regardless,
the vast majority of all task forces rely on grant funds
to pay salaries, which leaves very little to apply to
direct operating expenses.

D.O.E. includes necessary task force expenses
such as tracker cell time, bait vehicle cell time,
purchase of bait vehicle cameras, LPR license fees and
fuel costs. Historically those have been dependent on
program income Chapter 47 seizures to cover their D.O.E.
and have recently found themselves short on funds. Many
theories can be offered to why program income has fallen.

My theory, which is supported by our statistics, is that
we have become better stewards in finding the lawful
owners of stolen property which has produced fewer Chapter
47 seizures.

Looking forward to the upcoming legislative
session and the possibility that we may be funded at an
increased percentage, we must reexamine how funds will be
distributed. Some of those allotments should be dedicated
to better funding task force D.O.E. As proactive
investigations become more technical, better funding for
task force D.O.E. to acquire and maintain investigative
resources and equipment will greatly assist Texas auto
theft investigators in prosecuting auto theft offenders
and recovery of stolen motor vehicles.

Consideration must also be given to overtime
costs of having agents on call to remotely monitor these type of bait operations. Multi-jurisdictional task forces have the ability to conduct operations across a wide section of Texas. Proper funding of bait operations and stolen vehicle interdiction should be designed around personnel who have the ability to conduct the 24/7 operations. These types of operations within task forces could have deputies or officers assigned to assist the detectives who oversee the operations. The FTE position for a deputy would be much less than that of a detective, however, those operations are often hampered by lack of funds for personnel, technical equipment, overtime, callback and pay requirements.

Additionally, the Sunset Committee recently recommended additional responsibility of odometer rollback and title fraud investigations without consideration of additional detectives or investigators to perform these investigations. Effective odometer rollback and title fraud cases are often lengthy investigations which involve undercover agents posing as clients of businesses suspected of committing these violations. These type of operations involve numerous agents to conduct undercover type investigations to develop the evidence necessary to successfully prosecute the offenders. If the recommendation is passed, grantees will be given
additional responsibilities but there will be no increase in personnel to investigate the offense. Without funding for these specialized investigations, the plan simply fails.

The bottom line is that we can no longer function effectively at the rate of budget cuts. If the budget increase comes to fruition, then we must be ready for a plan that maximizes the potential of task forces that are struggling financially. It is equally important to bear in mind that any new full-time position that may be considered must include a vehicle, equipment, computer, uniforms, work station and housing.

In closing, I thank you for your time and consideration and would ask if fully funded, ABTPA prioritize appropriate funding for the day-to-day operating expenses of all the task forces.

Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Mr. Hale, as always, well said.

Thank you very much.

On Richard's comment, I would only like to follow up that this is something, a pain that we've all felt, every one of you in this room. I've been in your seat and have felt your pain, and just so you'll know, you can tell by the upcoming proposed budget, hopefully, depending on what the legislature does, that the goals and
objectives that were set forth by Richard's presentation is the goals and objectives of everybody in this room. And so duly noted, Richard. Thank you very much.

MR. MIZANI: One question.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. MIZANI: Looking at page 60 here, when you look at the budget obligations and the available, the $1.2- that's available, do we anticipate what will be the estimated carryforward for 2019, if there is any?

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

So what we've been doing for the last several years was we have been obligating current resources into future years to try to help cover. So this year what should have happened was when we got the $12-1/2 million budget, we should have cut all the grantees by 20 percent or 15-1/2 percent. Because we had held back about a million in obligation out of '17, when the Board voted to do the '18 grants, we went ahead -- we thought we were going to be funded about the same level and have what Richard was just talking about, some supplies and D.O.E. and equipment money, but as it turned out, we got cut by $2-1/2 million, so we used that million dollars to kind of buy into the future

And that's what we're planning on doing this
year again. If the legislature as of May 29 comes back with a number that's north of $12.9-, more than $12.9-, we can consider other alternatives this summer on how we can do things, but at this point, that $1.2- is how we've been able to hold 236 officers into the field. In other words, the money we didn't budget out of our current appropriation is how we've been able to hold onto the number of officers, and we'll plan on doing that again this year unless we get more money for '20, FY20 and '21, in which case then the Board can decide, okay, we'll go ahead and deal with that obligation now.

Does that help?

MR. MIZANI: It helps. And maybe I'm just misunderstanding it with the sheet that we have here for budget, but we were fortunate that in 2018 the governor and the LBB gave us that carryforward money. As you indicated, that hasn't always been the case, and so I guess from my perspective is if that isn't always the case we can depend on, I want to make sure that we are allocating those resources back to the task forces whenever we can. So it sounds like we really haven't anticipated yet because we're still waiting for May for the session to kind of go through, but we haven't really anticipated or estimated what a carryforward would look like to finish in 2019. Would that be correct?
MR. WILSON: Yeah. I mean, we have a lot of outstanding issues pending the session, but one of the things that the LBB and the Governor's Office in their questions back to me at that time, and I discussed with the chair -- I realize I can't call a meeting when the LBB asks a question, so I tried to work with, but part of their concern was if you're just going to do what you were going to do with this unexpended balance, and I said, Well, again, with the advice of the chair, we can't speak for the Board but the Board will try to look at some things that we haven't been able to do for several years that are our responsibility. Because we knew it wasn't going to be a million or it wasn't going to be a lot of money.

So that's what I'll be laying out next with kind of holding to that semi-commitment -- in other words, I don't commit on behalf of the Board but I do have to answer questions to the Legislative Budget Board and the governor that this $357- would try to buy back the four years now since we haven't done any statewide effort on communication, communicating strategy. Part of the $50,000 for the rapid response is an idea that we've been talking about for over two years, and then the PPRI, there's some talk about making changes in the grant process which means I have to change the programming and
the current application and enhance our reports that we're able to get.

So that's why this $357-, since it wasn't even part of our consideration at all, I was going to propose to the Board that we try to do something different so we can buy back some of the years that we've been languishing. It's not much money but I think we could make a start is what I'll be proposing. And the $1.2- that will be held until we figure out what the session is, and if that turns out that the session is very favorable to us, we'll be able to put that into the task forces and say, Okay, now who needs trucks, who needs LPRs, who needs some of the things that Mr. Hale just talked about, and then we can go ahead and try to liquidate that before the end of the year, and then we'll start the new year fresh.

MR. MIZANI: Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: So if I understand what you're telling us now is that if we know May 29 that we are going to get additional funds, then in the current grant year right now we could move forward with this $1.2- to address some things like Richard mentioned about trucks or vehicles or computers, or whatever equipment and things like that are needed, then we could do that this year.

MR. WILSON: The Board would have to lay out some parameters, because you can't do everything, you
can't add staff that quick, so you'd have to say, okay, what can we do and what would the task forces need that we could actually use this money for and do kind of a supplemental to their current grant.

MR. HANSEN: Richard, I know you're already done, but that's the direction that you're talking about. Correct?

MR. HALE: (Inaudible - speaking from audience.)

MR. HANSEN: Can you come up and speak at the mic?

MR. HALE: I'd use an example of HPD who was up here with $31,000 in overtime and the success that they had in that operation. It would be up to the Board to decide if you have extra money how can it best be utilized within all the task forces that have that type of needs that they have a proven track record that they can utilize those funds. So yes, it's good.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

Anything else on that item? Do you have anything else, Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: Well, we need to adopt the budget.

MR. HANSEN: Right.

MR. GAUSE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to adopt the FY19 budget as displayed on page 60 of
MR. HANSEN: Do we have a second?
MS. HUNTER: Second.
MR. HANSEN: Ms. Hunter.

A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the FY19 budget as displayed on page 60 of the board book.

Is there any other further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: I just have one comment on that is that remembering last year to streamline the process, although it wasn't the money we wanted that we knew what the money was going to be so it just made it easier to pretty much kind of split it in half as best we could and put this year on paper so that we can move forward and you didn't have to go through a whole long drug out process every year, so that's the reason why we're doing this the way we are today.

Any other further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All those in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes.

For the record, I'd like to note it is 10:12.
We'll take about a ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, at brief recess was taken.)

MR. HANSEN: We're going to get started real quick. Item number 9, Mr. Wilson, if you'd like to lay that out for us.

MR. WILSON: Sure. This will be an action item before the Board, something that we've been thinking about and talking about. What used to happen is this agency used to spend about a million dollars a year on statewide advertising and I guess in 2014, the meeting that occurred I guess my first day here, they had cut that to $600,000 but shortly, within a month or so after that I actually canceled the contract and mostly due to the fact that there were really no clear measures in that contract. I mean, they would talk about impressions but really couldn't get a handle on what they were supposed to provide to us, and so checked with the chair and then later the Board had authorized but in the meantime I had suspended the contract.

But one of the things about doing a direct purchase with the state in our particular statute is that million dollars was counting against our 8 percent threshold or maximum, so if the state went out and contracted with a private company to use those dollars, that million dollars was considered administrative cost.
and not direct. Even though the statute, ABTPA's primary statute is to fund law enforcement and to do public education, the way that that contract was set up, it would be called administrative and the Legislative Budget Board said -- matter of fact, one or two years that the Board actually went over because of that million dollar contract its 8 percent statutorily allowed administration.

Well, we've been considering how to meet our obligation and this unexpended balance authority has given us our first opportunity in several years to consider how to move forward, and also in a way that would cause this to be not administrative expense. So what I've laid out on page 62 through page 69 of your board book is a process where we could solicit, issue a request for applications to nonprofit corporations that are already in the business similar to what we do. I know of some of these organizations in existence right now, Insurance Council of Texas, AAA Texas, I know some insurance companies have nonprofit corporations that do this statewide education. There's others like the Texas Association of Counties --

MR. HANSEN: Sheriffs' Association.

MR. WILSON: Sheriffs' Association, Police Chiefs Association, TMPA. So any of these organizations that are already in this business and are already organized on a statewide basis to communicate these kind
of messages would be eligible, they would have to demonstrate their eligibility. So it's not open to a local marketing firm or even a nonprofit marketing firm that only covers the Houston area or the Austin area, they have to be on a statewide communication platform.

So if the Board approves, I will issue this out, publish it as broadly and as widely as I can to any nonprofits and we will seek applications for a plan for up to $200,000, and if the Board does it this way, when we spend any money it will not be administrative expense, it will be grant expense and it won't go against our 8 percent administrative threshold.

So I've laid out this, it's been reviewed by DMV fiscal, it's been reviewed by legal, and we think it's a great opportunity for us to get back into the business we used to be in of communicating to the public statewide, and that's what I'm recommending, that we go forward with this RFA. Now, I want to be clear, when you issue an RFA you might get 50 applicants or you might get none, but nobody has ever done something -- as far as I know, nobody has done anything like this, this is groundbreaking.

And so we will go forward, issue the RFA, we've got a procedure in place of the application. And then also, the question is then how do we review it, whether it's the grant -- whether you want to delegate the
authority to the Education and Legislative Committee to look at the grants when they come in and make a decision on your behalf. I know that's not in the motion here but I wanted to get that in front of you, because otherwise, if we publish it out for 30 days and we get two or three applications, then I have to sit on it till the next board meeting, or do you want to delegate it to one of your committees to make the decision and either A, bring it back to a recommendation or make the decision on behalf of you.

But this is really open for discussion, and again, it doesn't have -- because it's so groundbreaking, it's --

MR. HANSEN: Well, first off, I want to make it clear to everybody that this money for this item and the next two is not going to have an effect on your current budget for the upcoming year. None whatsoever.

I think for the future going forward, I think if we could partner and have folks like the Sheriffs' Association or the Texas Chiefs of Police Association, or both, helping spread our word and using their strength to support us in what we're doing could be very advantageous in the long term. So I just wanted to lay that out.

Is that the direction that you're thinking about?
MR. WILSON: Correct. We have these partners that are out there already doing this kind of work, let's see if any of them are interested in doing it for us.

MR. HANSEN: And the Insurance Council of Texas would be eligible as well, would they not?

MR. WILSON: Correct. They're already working with, I think, El Paso and Corpus handed out. Melissa, you did a great job on Corpus Christi, did a great job going on TV. Insurance Council of Texas gave thousands of dollars worth of signage to put in parking lots, Hide, Lock, Take, and other messages. So they've been a good partner with our task forces directly and they've always called me to say where can we help, so that's a really great organization, and many others are too. So I don't want to limit it to anybody but I do want to move forward, and we only have a little bit of time to spend this money so that's why it needs to move forward quickly. It's not a lot of money on a statewide basis. It sounds like a lot of money to you or me but on a statewide basis it's nothing like the million dollars we used to spend.

MR. HANSEN: One thing about the Insurance Council of Texas, having worked with them before, is they would take this money and combine it probably some of their money from other resources to help promote us.

MR. WILSON: Like I said, they're already doing
a lot of our work anyway.

MR. HANSEN: So we could be a force multiplier here with someone like that on this.

MR. WILSON: Correct. To be clear, like if they're doing signs and they say if we had this $200,000 we'd do radio or we'll do television or we'll do YouTube channels, this Board is not approving what that plan is because those applicants have to tell us what it is. Does that make sense? So today we're saying we know what the money is and we would like a plan, and then we would compare to say, well, you know, Group A is doing radio and we're not sure radio is a really good place for our money, but Group B is doing television or parking lot signs, I don't know, just whatever, and then that's what will determine what we think will be in our best interests.

MR. HANSEN: Which will come right back on the Board's responsibility to choose which way we want to go.

MR. WILSON: Either that or delegate it to the committee of the Board. It has to be the Board ultimately, either you delegate to select the vendor -- select them to review it and bring it back to the Board for a final vote.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. All right.

MR. GAUSE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to adopt the request for applications for a
statewide public education and awareness grant as displayed on pages 62 through 69 of the board book, and I'd further move to request that the Board adopt a budget up to $200,000 to fund one grant.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Gause. Do we have a second?

MS. HUNTER: Second.

MR. HANSEN: Ms. Hunter. A motion has been made and seconded to adopt a request for applications for a statewide public education and awareness grant with a budget up to $200,000 to fund one grant. Is there any other further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Hearing none, we'll take a vote. In favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Against?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Motion passes. Thank you.

Number 10.

MR. WILSON: So before we move on that, I just want to see if the Board wants to entertain a motion for delegation to the committee or just get the results and come back to the Board.

MR. HANSEN: I'd like to get the results first.
and come back.

MR. WILSON: That's fine.

MR. HANSEN: I'd like to ask the Board

MR. MIZANI: Can you repeat that again?

MR. WILSON: Do you want the results brought back to the Board or delegated to the Legislative and Education Committee, or one of the committees.

MR. HANSEN: Education Committee, that would be fine too.

MS. HUNTER: I think it should just go to Education.

MR. HANSEN: Go to the committee.

Do we need to make a motion on that?

MR. RICHARDS: No, that's fine.

MR. HANSEN: Okay.

MR. WILSON: So when we publish it, and we'll follow all the rules, grant rules, and then we'll bring it back. We'll let the Legislative and Education Committee review it and then work through the chair.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Item number 10, I don't know that we have any of our grantees that are wanting to talk about our grant management and tracking system. We can always bring back the eGrants system if they prefer, but I think overall most people have learned to find it to be pretty
intuitive, or how we're able to collect data and track performance on the grants, how they're able to do their budget adjustments online and get fairly quick approval. It used to be four budget adjustments limited and now they can do it as they need to, but we still need a little bit better reporting, and then also, we're going to be talking in a few minutes about the grant application for next year.

And so what we're recommending in this next item is -- I haven't gotten the budget so I can't say this much or that much, but we know we're going to need enhancements for the new cycle. The system works perfectly if we do exactly what we did last time, so I don't want anybody to misunderstand that something is broken, like in the case of eGrants, but I'm anticipating that the committee might want to make some changes, and if I do that, I can't wait until after you decide to make changes to come back and ask for money because then we'll be into June or July before the application can ever be done.

So I'm asking for authority of around $15,000. The whole package is $50,000 but the part of it is $15,000 for updating any changes that this Board makes regarding the 20-21 application, and then Dan and I have identified a few -- and these are just examples, I'm not
asking you to vote on these specific items -- ways that we can get better reporting out of our system for both the grantees -- I mean, the Board may not know but every grantee in this room can go to the system and they can see what the other grants are doing, what adjustments -- I guess not adjustments but they can see how many arrests, how many recoveries, all their data that they're being held to the same standard, they can compare across grantees and see that. They can see how well they're doing compared to other grantees for the number of officers, the money.

I don't know if it's a good tool. Sometimes we probably should have a discussion about it, but overall, the transparency has gone from almost zero to total transparency. I want to keep that up and I want to make it even more transparent in the way that we can run reports and see data assimilated and put together.

So the second thing that's on this, the National Institute of Justice, on page 73, issued a thing that's near and dear to my heart, both in substance abuse, the years I ran substance abuse programming as well as the state court system, indigent defense and child protection processes in the state courts, and that's using police officer driven research to start thinking about how we do our business. And A&M has put together a couple of
proposals. For years we did those offender data surveys through TDCJ, and we haven't identified the specific project but we'd like to set aside money.

The other one is if you'll look at the data that's in GMTS right now, you'll see a wide array of results from bait cars, and we don't do anything about the process of bait cars. You know, are the windows down, are the keys in it, are the keys visible, what are the features, are there other things in the car. Nobody in the United States that I can find has ever done research on bait cars but we use it all the time, and we have no idea what the strategies are that end up in better results.

So again, using our officers, going out to the field, identifying projects and try to leverage that National Institute of Justice model for officer-directed research, we're asking about $35,000 for that and it would be part of an interagency agreement with Texas A&M to be defined, and I'd work through the committees to identify that.

MR. GAUSE: Is this an either/or option on the options presented here, or does the ability exist to do both?

MR. WILSON: Well, it's just examples of what we could do. I gave them the NIJ research and I gave them
some of my data and the research, the principals at A&M said, Well, just based on -- I haven't given them everything but I gave them some ideas. I gave them the document on page 73 and page 74, and said, What would this look like for our officers? And the principals came back and said, Here are two examples from what we looked at your data that we think we could do some very straightforward research on. And so it might end up being something else, but I'd work through the Board committee for that but I just wanted to show that we really should take the responsibility to document the great work.

These guys work tirelessly day in and day out but nobody ever really looks at the process and how we could get better and improve our performance and document that performance before the legislature, so that's part of what's going on here.

MR. HANSEN: Two things on this. That's key because you're going to keep hearing legislature, legislature, and they're going to ask questions, because as we well know, some technologies that we use get challenged periodically or they're going to be challenged legislatively, and this gives us an idea to be able to justify through actual research of what everybody is doing and how this works.

And then Mr. Wilson's comment about the
transparency on the grant tracking system, one of the key reasons that I feel the LBB and what we've been able to come up with in the recommendation that you're going to see that has been laid out there on increased funding for us comes from a lot of different areas, but one of the key factors in that is their respect for this organization as to the transparency of what everybody does and their ability to see how we spend the money we have. And they've been very verbal with that with Mr. Wilson.

So I know Mr. Wilson, sometimes he can be a pain to all of us but it's paying off for us and y'all need to know that. When you see what's coming up from LBB, a lot of the key part of that element of that money recommendation from them comes from there's no question in their mind that we're one of the most transparent agencies in state government and we do what we say we're going to do, and what we spend money for, we accomplish things. And that all comes from being able to generate and capture more of what each and every one of you guys and gals are doing every day, putting yourselves on the line, and what you're doing he's capturing more and more of that and it's starting to show up in all of our reports. And that's a kudos to you all but you've always been doing it, we're just getting it better. And so I just wanted to follow up on that little thing about the contract on the computer.
database of what we do, tracking everything that you guys do out there. It's become more important than we ever imagined as of right now.

MR. GAUSE: Mr. Hansen, I'd echo that. Just in the little bit that I've looked around in the system and seeing some of the reports and the narratives that have been updated by the agencies is really helpful for me to get a better understanding of what's happening and how agencies are performing. But even in the option two that we're talking about, the bait vehicle piece of things, that's a place where the insurance industry often provides vehicles to have some data that says when you provide it, this is what happens on the other side and we have a mechanism to make them more effective, I think it would definitely help going forward with their engagement.

MR. HANSEN: If there was kind of somewhat of a standard protocol then the insurance industry would be more likely to support with more vehicles.

MR. GAUSE: Exactly because, you know, as that vehicle is given from the insurance company, if you will, that's a loss on salvage value that otherwise could have potentially benefitted or offset claims. To see that it's going to have a beneficial impact downstream in reducing auto theft or having a positive effect on that side, it creates a more willing environment, I would say.
MR. HANSEN: Well, there you have it. If this results in us getting some more bait cars, the cost of one bait car exceeds what we're expending here to do this. Bait cars are instrumental to every group out here. Thank you, Mr. Gause.

Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: We need a motion.

MS. KINNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to adopt the request to modify the contract with Texas A&M University for modifications to the GMTS system as displayed on pages 71 to 75 of the board book.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Ms. Kinney. Do we have a second?

MR. MIZANI: Second.

MR. HANSEN: Armin, thank you.

A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the request to modify the contract with Texas A&M University for modifications to the GMTS system as displayed on pages 71 through 75 in our board book. Is there any other further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Hearing none, all in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Opposed?

(No response.)
MR. HANSEN: That motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

Number 11.

MR. WILSON: This is of the unexpended balance authority that we received, the last $50,000 is a process that I've worked through with legal as well as TxDMV purchasing on how we could best move forward on a concept we started discussing with this Board a little over two years ago called the Rapid Response Strike Force. This item is what you see on page 77 and 78 of your board book is a process -- with one misspelling; I don't know what twill is but I'll get that out of there. But the issue here is that there are two items. Richard Hale a couple of years ago was telling me about they were playing around with some drones and looking at some drone technology and said, Man, I wish we had a way to combat auto theft or burglary of a motor vehicle on these big events that they have. And so while we're not going to fund positions, full-time FTEs under this kind of funding, if somebody had an immediate need for equipment.

A few months ago the City of Kyle experienced, just south of Austin, 39 burglaries in a one or two week period. They had, I think, 15 every year on average for the years before that for burglary of a motor vehicle. And so these are things where Travis County or one of our
grantees can come to us and say I've got this neighboring county, I've got this other jurisdiction -- I mean, we've got Harris County here, there's really not a lot of coverage in Brazoria and they've got Houston that's oftentimes working in Fort Bend, and they could come in and say, you know, we've got all these juggings or whatever -- and I'm not picking on them just because of previous conversations, it's available to anybody -- but you could reach out to another jurisdiction, the task force could fund overtime, equipment, travel.

Jeff Parsons just spent their travel money out of their budget to go down to Dimmitt County to help the sheriff down there and they had some good success. I'm looking forward to hearing about that. We didn't fund that one through the Rapid Response but that's the kind of thing we would have been able to pay for somebody.

In the past ABTPA used to do Operation Gate where people from Dallas and Houston would go down to the border, they'd learn about border ops and then they would use their LPRs and their equipment and get travel and reimbursement, and it makes the system work better across the whole state.

So I know it's not much money, we're only proposing one or two events for this first year, but $50,000, and I have a couple of examples with Dimmit
County. You see a letter where the Dimmit County Sheriff's Office asked for resources, Victoria stepped up without us even having this process in place.

And then we've talked to NICB. They've reached out to original manufacturers and come up with a way where we could start marking tailgates with a QR code. Thank you, Bryan Sudan, who talked me out of RFID chips that I was so intent on. But NICB has already found the printers, they're willing to put up their money, but we could put up money for like advertising for our local governments or fund readers in the jurisdictions throughout every police department within a region to say we're going to mark every tailgate we can get ahold of and here's the partial VIN or the VIN. And NICB has already figured it out. They've got money but sometimes we need to put our money with somebody else to do a project like this.

So that's examples that I'm thinking for this year but there might be surprises that these guys come up with, but each one of these under this proposal, if it's less than $5,000, they would come to me, I would turn in one of these applications, and I could make that on your behalf. Now, I'm not going to do it by myself, I'll take consultation from the chair and the committees, probably by phone call, but I'll make that decision on that
project. If it's between $5- and $15,000, if you adopt this policy, it will go to the committee via phone vote or email vote with the application, here's what they're proposing. And then if it's more than $15,000, it has to come before this Board based on what we've provided to DMV.

So you see this Track 2, I haven't worked that out with DPS. One of the big concerns that I have, just take Rick over here from El Paso and he wants to do a big criminal organization thing that has lots of confidential information, DPS said in a meeting yesterday that they would look at participating at this level but I don't want Rick to start sending me all this confidential gang stuff that is subject to open records under DMV because we do not have a law enforcement exception to the open records request, DPS does. So there's some mechanics on this Track 2 that I don't think we're going to be able to do this year until we work out some issues, but you can go ahead and adopt the policy.

MR. GONZALES: Mr. Chairman, this is Dominic Gonzales, for the record. Just to let you know that we do have someone signed up to speak on the Victoria operation.

MR. HANSEN: Right, we have two. I'm fixing to call them up.

MR. WILSON: So anyway, the Track 2, I'm
recommending that you approve the policy but there's some mechanics that have to be worked out with DPS. Again, I'm only trying to shield our police operations, their names, undercover information, things like that that if it comes into this office, I'm not saying that we would have to disclose it, I'm just saying that then we have a legal problem with David having to defend whether that should be disclosed from a law enforcement perspective, and we're not set up as an agency for that routine operation. It's not that we can't, I just want to be careful that things don't come into this office because DPS always says no to everything because almost everything they do is a criminal operation.

MR. MIZANI: Bryan, when you say that the awards are going to be limited to one or two in the first year, you're talking projects overall, in total?

MR. WILSON: That's my plan. I mean, if everyone in this room right now turned in one this afternoon, I'd be here till July, whatever, September, trying to sort them out.

MR. MIZANI: But we're capping it at up to $50,000. Correct?

MR. WILSON: Correct.

MR. HANSEN: And this is really more just a pilot because this is money that won't affect any grants
and we don't know what the next budget is going to be.

MR. MIZANI: So if someone needs a drone, this is play money, in a sense, for these guys. So I guess my only comment is, if we're capping it at $50,000 -- which I agree since it's a pilot program -- why are we in the language here limiting it to only one or two. If we get ten applicants at $5,000, I'd much rather be able to afford that at ten applicants than just cap it at one or two.

MR. WILSON: I was doing a sales job for DMV and everybody else.

MR. MIZANI: When you said drones, you sold me with drones.

MR. WILSON: But it probably shouldn't have been part of the policy, but I was also trying to set expectation. I mean, when you adopt a first time out policy like that, you're trying to kind of limit the chaos. Nobody has ever done this before so I can't really -- so like staff time. It was more instead of -- what do you call it -- instead of prescriptive I was trying to be proscriptive and just say, well, I think we're only going to do one or two this year.

MR. HANSEN: I agree. Particularly if they're smaller ones we can surely do more than that.

MR. MIZANI: So do we need to modify that?
We're okay with that?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Quick question. This would also be open to other law enforcement agencies? Could this be only for current task forces as opposed to everybody?

MR. WILSON: Again, this is your policy and I'm fine for you striking out the -- because right now we don't have a motion on the floor so you could strike the one or two, and then you can say, at least in the policy that you're adopting, law enforcement -- it says the three types of agencies that could qualify for funding. I don't know that you need to change that because what's going to happen is this year you can tell me, hey, let's do it to ABTPA till we see if it works. You could say it's a pilot project or you could make it part of the motion that it would just be open to ABTPA officers.

One of the things that these guys told me when we had our meeting in TAVTI was that they were not okay in all circumstances -- I'm just going to pick on Houston because I know y'all have been doing jugging stuff down in Fort Bend County -- they're not okay, if Fort Bend Sheriff's Office wanted to join them on the juggling and we've already got a grant contract, it's going to be a lot of work for Capt. Bennett to go out and get an MOU with Fort Bend because they don't have one and it will take
weeks to figure that out and get the Fort Bend Sheriff's Office to sign off on the MOU. And so what the thought was is if Capt. Bennett comes up and says I can do this jugging operation with overtime to Fort Bend, will you pay them directly for the overtime for this project. In other words, it's an ABTPA led project but he doesn't want to have to go to commissioners court or city council to deal with the MOU, so under his direction, Fort Bend would turn in the request and I would give them -- if we approved it for $5,000 worth of overtime or whatever, then they would run their jugging operation with Fort Bend SO and then they're good. Does that make sense?

And so I was trying to leave that level of flexibility even in the first year if it was done by one of our grantees but they just don't want to spend six weeks or eight weeks doing a MOU.

MR. HANSEN: Before we go any further, we've got a couple of speakers that want to speak on this. Jeff and Jerry from Victoria. Do y'all want to come up? If you could identify yourselves, please.

MR. PARSONS: Thank you. I'm Detective Jeff Parsons, Victoria Police Department Auto Crimes Task Force.

Recently we were advised that Dimmit County was having some issues with a lot of human trafficking and so
forth and stolen vehicles were being used for that, and
they were asking for help, and so basically, we
communicated. Israel Pacheco with the NICB was
instrumental in trying to get everybody together, and so
we ended up working with Dimmit County, Homeland Security,
NICB, DPS, Border Patrol and Victoria put together a joint
operation.

The issues they were having was these vehicles
would load up with illegals and then whenever law
enforcement would figure out, hey, this is not kosher and
they tried to stop them, then they would find a place to
run through a fence or something like that and they will
run through a ranch as far as they can until the truck
breaks down, crashes or whatever, and then everybody
scatters.

So we had helicopters and so forth, we had
plenty of air support during this operation, and we had
several meetings. And at first we started out, we have a
license plate reader on one of our interceptors, so we
took our interceptor down with the license plate reader
and we took two pickup trucks down that are unmarked and
we have a lot of tools and things in those pickup trucks
that we can use to help identify vehicles if the
identification is altered and so on.

So we took all of that equipment with us. It
was myself, Detective Sepulveda and our sergeant, Sergeant Buck. Made arrangements to stay there, we arrived in Carrizo Springs on Saturday. We just got back from Victoria yesterday evening. So the operations began late Sunday afternoon and the first way we were trying to do this thing, we would have a meeting and come to a consensus, and so what we were trying to do first is to intercept the stolen vehicles as they were coming southbound on I-35 with the license plate reader and try to get them before they come down to the border and load up with illegals. And that was the plan, but kind of like the great philosopher, Mike Tyson, once said, everybody has got a plan till somebody hits you in the mouth.

(General laughter.)

MR. PARSONS: And so we worked really hard all afternoon Sunday and all night Sunday night trying to implement the plan as proposed but we just really weren't having any luck. So again, we had frequent meetings and so forth and so we would adapt and we would change our procedures and so forth.

So on Monday we began thinking, you know what, we may just have to start to looking more at the back roads and we may just have to catch them coming back, get them either way, going, coming, whatever we have to do. And the other thing that's important -- and we explained...
to the folks who were working with us that yeah, the LPR
we were kind of using it as the tip of the spear but you
cannot just rely on the LPR, it's simply a piece of
equipment, there's a number of ways to defeat it. These
cartels know that, and I'll get into that in a minute
where some of them, yes, they did some things to defeat
it. So that's just one instrument, one tool that we can
use, but it has to be a team effort and we have to have
everyone looking for all sorts of different probable
causes, and then we can all converge as a team and work on
it.

So we began to look at it more like that, and
beginning Monday night we started having some success.
The first one we had was about 10:00 p.m. or so on Highway
83, which is one of the back roads leading from the
border, they try to make it over to I-35 to go north, and
a deputy was using his good police skills and just as we
were about to meet that truck, he picked up on some sort
of PC, lit it up and the chase was on.

They ran through a fence and into a ranch, the
chase went for a while. Eventually they got into a swampy
area and they got bogged down and stuck in mud, as almost
we did too. So anyway, of course it was full of illegal
aliens, they all scattered. We had a helicopter,
fortunately, we were able to scoop up eight, I believe,
aliens that had been in that truck. That particular truck was a white Dodge Ram 2500. They take the rear seats out so they can put more people in there; they also put people in the bed and so forth.

And this is all part of the learning process, not just for our agency but for everyone. So we as auto theft investigators, once we help them get everybody rounded up and stuff, we want to get eyes on that vehicle, we want to see what's going on. Border Patrol was going to process it. Of course we're giving them some suggestions and so forth on what to look for evidence-wise, but we're checking.

For example, that first truck, the VINs were not altered, however, both of the license plates and the interesting thing is the sticker, the registration sticker on the inside of the windshield, they all matched, they go to a white Dodge Ram truck but a different year model. The truck was stolen out of San Antonio but the sticker and the registration was stolen out of Wilson County and not reported stolen. So I'm in contact with an investigator out of Wilson County now that's going to go to the house. We're still in process of following up on this stuff.

So in other words, had they had not had this other assistance, it's possible, okay, we got the aliens,
we got the truck, here it, get the owner, probably
insurance company, but there's other stuff to be cleaned
up here. Are the people in Wilson County involved in this
or not. We don't know. How did they get that sticker off
of the windshield? We know that it was in pristine
condition and put on the other vehicle. Was it on the
wrong vehicle? Was someone involved in insurance fraud
trying to make the truck disappear? These are things we
don't know but we are going to follow up on.

Since we were involved in this, these are some
additional things that we can go ahead and follow up on
the future and help these agencies out, because I can tell
you they are just swamped with this stuff, this stolen
vehicle and illegal alien traffic. I mean, every time we
turned around on the radio there's another chase, another
bail out, just every few hours around the clock. It was
an eye-opening experience, let me tell you.

So the next night, the next evening, we had
another vehicle. Same thing, we kind of focused more on
the back roads. Unbeknownst to us, we're heading down 83
right toward a Ford F-250. The LPR would have hit on,
Border Patrol figured it out first. Again, the chase is
on, high speed chase, long story behind all of that, our
engine gave out, Jerry had to pick us up in the other
vehicle, but anyway, we eventually get out there, they run
through another ranch, they run through gates and the whole deal, they bail out, everybody is gone, the backseat is out, you can see on the tailgate where all the people in the bed of the truck was bailing out, so it was full of people, we know that. Had another helicopter out.

So again, we're looking from case to case as auto theft investigators. We want to know what's the M.O., do they have a certain pattern, are they doing the same thing every time, you know. In this case the MO was a little different. This particular vehicle was stolen out of Austin, it was stolen three days prior, they did all the work to take the backseat out and everything, had plenty of time to change the tags but they didn't change the tags. So in this case had Border Patrol not hit it, the LPR would have hit it, it would have given us an alert.

So it was a little different from the first one. None of the VINs were tampered with on that one either. You know, we were able to look at that. There was some evidence that we were able to point out to the Border Patrol as they were processing it and things that we think may possibly lead to a connection in Midland. So again, some of these things hopefully can be followed up on in the future and so on.

And as far as technicalities goes, as far as
logistics and things goes, of course, making reservations in hotels, the travel, the gas and the manpower and stuff, there's a lot of logistical stuff that I know on this side the ABTPA Board has to consider, okay, if we have a rapid response the paperwork and so forth and how we're going to move the money around and do all of that, keep track of things. But let me tell you something, on the other side there's going to be issues we're going to have to work out too. Like the City of Victoria, for example, this was not a trip with hotels and per diem for training, this was for an operation in a different part of the state and I thought they were going to have a heart attack. I mean, it was just red tape.

We finally got it squared away, but this is stuff on the other side, on the county side, on the city side that they are going to have to look forward and try to be proactive and understand we may be leaving to do operations here, there and elsewhere and so we need to streamline our process as to how we do these approvals and move things through finance and so on and so forth because it was a bit of nightmare for a couple of days there. I think my sergeant was about ready to hang himself. Anyway, we finally got it straightened out. So I just wanted to mention that.

The other thing that was very eye-opening to me
is that, you know, you hear a lot of talk on television and with the news and all the politics and stuff concerning the immigration issues and all like that, but you don't hear about the collateral crime. What struck me is every time -- and look, I feel bad for the people trying to get over here. I understand they're trying to get over here for a better life and so on and so forth. I might do the same thing, you know what I'm saying? But what you don't hear about and what struck me is that these vehicles that's being used to smuggle them in, Texans are being victimized. These vehicles are all stolen and if you don't have insurance, you're directly victimized, if you do have insurance the insurance company is going to have to pay for it and then we all have to pay for it. So one way or the other, directly or indirectly, Texans are being victimized on a very, very regular basis.

We stopped Tuesday evening to have supper together and everybody, it's been great working with you and stuff, and these guys didn't even get to finish their supper. We were ending our operation because we had to go come home the next morning, and they're gone, there was another bailout, another stolen car. Actually, two or three guys had to leave first and then the rest of them had to leave for another bailout before we could even finish eating. So that's a lot of stolen cars, that's a
lot of Texans that are being victimized.

MR. HANSEN: I think what his point brings to

is where this money would be advantageous is what was

mentioned earlier, like Operation Gates, if some of you

are familiar with those, where they were coordinating at

that time mainly with DPS or with our border partner task

forces, and people from all over the state would go down

and help with the border checks. And number one, as you

indicated, vehicles were being recovered from all over the

state, so the odds are if you go down there you're going
to recover one of your own. I mean, you just made a point

of about seven different jurisdictions that you named off

there.

And also, those type of programs were

phenomenal training programs, because if you've got

somebody new and you examine a couple hundred cars a day,

and the same applies to our outbound seaports where we

have done things in the past -- and there's more

conversation on that later with Customs -- but the same

thing applies there is when they go examine ports like in

Houston or Galveston -- I know Galveston what did y'all

look at, over 1,200 cars in one day? One day. I

guarantee you there's stolen stuff from all over the

place. And again, if you want to use it as a training

tool as well and you look at 1,200 cars in one day, you're
getting your dose of medicine there.

So I think these are the type of programs that somewhere down the line if we get additional funding, and these pilot programs, I think, will prove well that this could be something that could be utilized by a lot of the task forces all over for proactive policing versus reactive policing.

MR. PARSONS: And one thing, too, I think you have to remember, I think like Border Patrol, for example, they do a great job and they're looking for the human smuggling, they're not necessarily interested in the stolen car. They'll process it just to see who's driving because they want to know who the smugglers are and so forth, but working together like this, we're able to -- as auto theft detectives, we're not just interested in the human smuggling, we're interested in who stole that car, what's their MO, et cetera, et cetera. And we can follow back, just like on these registration, we can follow it back doing investigations a little further and see what's up, you know, who's doing what, is there insurance fraud involved, how the cars are being stolen, or whatever, because we're going to take more of an interest also in the stolen cars.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let me just comment based on
something real quick here. This year, I believe, BP is
doing different tiers for grant funds. Last year we did
an operation in Laredo with funds from CBP, and what they
did they ended up funding overtime for Operation Full
Throttle, and that operation itself -- and I just remember
right now that we had it here for the DPS meeting that we
had yesterday -- that operation, there was 65 targets
arrested, 80 stolen vehicles, 14 stash houses and 223
illegals.

Now, I think we should have a conversation also
with Border Patrol when it comes to operation like this
because they have a lot of money for them to also fund
this kind of collaborative effort, especially when we're
going to jurisdictions like Carrizo Springs and things of
that nature.

But nonetheless, you hit the nail on the head.

When I was talking about teamwork and about creating a
team here, you're talking about Midland, talking about San
Antonio, talking about different jurisdictions, I think
it's very important that we always communicate with those
jurisdictions and say, Hey, I've got one of your vehicles
here. Even though they'll say, okay, great, thanks, but
at least we're communicating and saying, hey, I'm down
here at the border and this is what I have.

But nonetheless, we're talking about cartels,
very dangerous, they're getting smarter. Right now the organization that they have for human smuggling, you know, it's a great business for them. They don't have to grow anything, they don't have no chemicals to mix, just bodies at $2,400, $5,000 a body. That's a lot of money.

So what I propose is we try this Strikeforce and commit in the future, hopefully we can commit more funds to it, because I know $50,000 are going to go real quick.

So I applaud you for the operation and it was an outstanding job.

MR. PARSONS: One thing I just want to mention too, we worked with several of the federal guys, and those guys are incredible. They are working long and hard hours and right now even though they're going to have to wait on a paycheck. I just wanted to mention that and give them kudos. They were awesome.

MR. HANSEN: Jerry, did you have something?

MR. SEPULVEDA: I believe he pretty much said it all.

MR. HANSEN: It's hard to follow that act, isn't it?

(General laughter.)

MR. PARSONS: Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciate
it very, very much. Job well done, well done, as always.

MR. WILSON: So this is your policy. I mean, again, I have no problems. If you want to go forward with this policy you can strike for the first year, or you can just instruct, you don't really have to strike the policy, but you can instruct that this first year we'll only do it for grant programs. And then the other issue, the one to two, I think, Mr. Mizani, that you raised, then you can just go ahead and instruct in the motion and instruct post motion, however Mr. Richards says.

MR. MIZANI: I just want to make sure that there's a lot of flexibility for staff and task force agents. The bullet point number two, when you say law enforcement agencies are in the coverage area of grant funded task forces -- I understand that -- but do not have staff funded in the program, what do you mean by that?

MR. WILSON: Well, thank you for asking that because we have two things in our grant applications. We have participating jurisdictions and we have coverage jurisdictions. So we have Fort Worth here and they're a good example because they have Arlington and they have Weatherford, Parker County, but they also cover Jack County on 68A inspections, but there's nobody in the Jack County Sheriff's Office or anybody that's participating but they go over and provide coverage. Matter of fact, I
think you've got a half time person over in Longview,
which is one of the larger cities in that East Texas area,
that they cover but they don't have any participation from
that law enforcement.

So a good example, if Lieutenant Richbourg
wants to do an operation in Longview where they have so
much population, so many stolen cars, he could make an
application for Rapid Response, get overtime for the Gregg
County Sheriff's Office and pay overtime through their
grant. Again, in this case he would be in the same boat
where he doesn't want to get a MOU set up for a three-week
operation that will take six weeks to set up the MOU. So
he could coordinate for the Gregg County Sheriff's
Office -- again, this is just an example -- to send an
application, a Rapid Response application for $5,000 or
less than $5,000 overtime to run in his operation for
breaking up a criminal organization, or whatever his plan
is.

So that was the second threshold. We kind of
want the first threshold to be our grant funded
organizations, the second threshold is people that are
covered by our grant but not participating, and then the
third one is any other law enforcement agency.

MR. MIZANI: I guess that's my question maybe
for the committee: Do we want to limit that second
component, when you say they're participating --

MR. WILSON: They're covered but not participating.

MR. MIZANI: -- they're covered but not participating.

MR. WILSON: Right.

MR. MIZANI: Do we want to limit it in that fashion, or do we want to just generalize it and allow for everyone?

MR. WILSON: Again, I wrote this in order of priority, so again, you can give instructions that for this pilot phase from now until September, August 31, it would be just priority number one, so that's all we do.

MR. HANSEN: I would think that some of the requests -- and I'm open for input from the crowd out here -- that some of the requests are more likely going to come from number two and that they have areas surrounding their primary staffing group that they provide investigative resources and stuff but they don't have somebody assigned, and there's a problem there, that's where they're going to go. I think that we'd probably most likely get those type of requests, outside the border and the port stuff, for these type of programs.

Number three, I think starting would be completely any agencies totally outside of any of the
service areas for the task forces, I think for the pilot program I think we should probably try to stick within the areas of the task forces. And then if it's successful and it works okay and we get some more money next go-round, well, then we could look at expanding that.

MR. MIZANI: And this is really just prioritizing. We're not saying you need to meet these certain criteria, this is just for your purposes.

MR. WILSON: Right. If San Angelo sent me an application and Longview sent me an application, in the order of priority I'd have to go with Longview because they're in our coverage area and San Angelo is totally outside of any area.

MR. MIZANI: Okay. Makes sense to me.

Appreciate it.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So when would this start?

MR. WILSON: Immediately.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So where would the task forces send the operational plan?

MR. WILSON: Well, if they want to do -- they would have to hold it locally. Again, if it's a straightforward, you know, just simple operation that doesn't require law enforcement confidential information, they would send everything to me. If they had elements -- so again, that example I used with Rick a while ago,
they're really wanting to do a gang strikeforce with all
the local jurisdictions in that area for El Paso, he needs
to hold on to the confidential stuff and I'll just have to
ask questions.

There's two parts to the application: one is a
financial part -- you still have to tell me overtime,
equipment -- help me out here -- travel, you still have to
say what that is, and then there's an estimate that I
think I'll get five vehicles recovered and three arrests
out of this program. So you're going to have to tell me
that, but everything else, until we work out something
with DPS, the task force commanders would have to hold the
law enforcement operation plan in their jurisdiction. And
I can see it if I go to El Paso or if I go to Dallas, I
would be able to look at what their plan is to see if I
think it's reasonable, but I prefer that they not send it
at this time until we work out some other mechanism. My
proposal with DPS, they said they'd have to look at it,
run it through their legal, so it could be months before
we get any traction on that.

So Track 1 is what we're clearly able to do
right away. What Jeff Parsons, Detective Parsons just
spoke about, travel to run go help Dimmit County, that's
not really law enforcement confidential, you're not trying
to give any details, so that would be Track 1.
Track 2 is like Operation Full Throttle and now all of a sudden I've got all kinds of complexities that come with that, we'll have to work that out.

MR. GAUSE: Given that it's uncharted territory, do you have an idea of from application to approval what that timeline may look like just from a general expectation?

MR. WILSON: I think that some of these requests would be very straightforward and simple and ten working days at the max. Again, why did I say one or two is because, remember, during the same time we're going to be doing the 2021 application. I mean, our staff has a full load already with still monitoring the grants that we have this year, so that's why the limiting. The only issue on that limit was that first year I just don't know how we could -- I mean, look, we work overtime, we do a lot of stuff because we're supporting people who are really dedicated.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So can we assign maybe three commanders from the different task forces to oversee the operational plan for now and then the after action to see that we're effective as to what they did with the money that was given to them?

MR. HANSEN: I think a working committee later after they're done to look at the programs and see.
MR. WILSON: I think the policy is fine as it is, and then what I can do is -- I think that they could just hold it locally. I mean, everybody is responsible to their own police agency and I don't mind trying to figure out with that commander. Again, just in the interim, not as the long term. But Track 1 is what we're going to have to stick with, and then if it's a Track 2 then I'll have to get the chairman and the Grants Committee, which is you, Chairman, to be involved about how we can protect our confidentiality.

MR. MIZANI: If we're ready, I'll make a motion. I'd like to make a motion and move that the ABTPA Board adopt a Rapid Response Strikeforce plan and a budget of not to exceed $50,000, but also no limitation to the number of awards up to that $50,000, as displayed on pages 77 to 83 of the ABTPA board meeting book.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'll second.

MR. HANSEN: Mike, you seconded?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.

A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the request to authorize a Rapid Response Strikeforce plan as displayed on pages 77 through 83 of the board book, limited to $50,000 with no limits to the number of awards.

Is there any further discussion? Any comments?
(No response.)
MR. HANSEN: All those in favor?
(A chorus of ayes.)
MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. HANSEN: That motion passes.
Good discussion, guys. Thank you.
Number 13.
MR. WILSON: I think we're on 12.
MR. HANSEN: Twelve. I'm sorry.
MR. WILSON: All right. So this is the first draft or at least the outline, it's not intended to be the full document. You see in your board book that I've highlighted in yellow things that need to be addressed going forward, because we never had border security. Typically a grant term and the obligation term is always one year in state budgeting but what we've done is one application for a two year period. Because you don't have any legal authority to issue a grant for two years because you don't have budget authority for that, we do one application for a two year cycle and then you can reallocate or re-award the grant on the second year. So this is the second cycle we've done it in. I think most people are pretty happy not to be filing applications constantly year after year, so I think that's a good idea.
So I think the proposal kind of changed over the last couple of days in discussion so what we're asking you to do, because of the time frame, and the cities and counties need the maximum amount of time to work through their budget issues with their city councils and commissioners courts, the original thought when we sent out this book was that we would just ask you to appoint either me or the Grants Committee to work through it and bring it back at a next meeting. Discussion with the chair and others the last couple of days, the time frame, that's going to really leave a very short time frame for the grant application.

So to give the cities and counties greater flexibility and more time, what we're proposing in this motion before you that you may consider is that you would go ahead and authorize the issuance of the FY20-21 RFA so that the director, after approval -- what does it say, review and approval from the Grants Committee, would then just issue it once it's been finalized through that committee. So it's really an authorization to issue and a delegation to the committee for the final version. And that way instead of coming back in March or April and then giving the cities and counties basically 30 or 40 days to apply, they will likely have 60 to 90 days to work through their commissioners and city councils.
So that's what's being considered before you. All these details I'll work through, including the scoring mechanism, for consideration.

MR. MIZANI: I'll make a motion if no questions. I make a motion and move that the ABTPA Board authorize the ABTPA director to issue the fiscal year 20-21 request for applications after review and approval from the Grants, Budget and Reports Committee. This includes review of the grant application scoring system.

MR. GAUSE: I second the motion.

MR. HANSEN: A motion has been made and seconded to authorize the ABTPA director for FY20-21 request for applications after review and approval of the Grants, Budget and Reports Committee. The motion includes a review of the grant application scoring system. Is there any discussion?

I have discussion. I just want to make it very clear, and this is the reason why we changed this, is having communications with a lot of the grantees through the years and having been on the other side of the table, the scoring system is something that everybody questions. This is why we wanted to go before the Grants Committee which will include our law enforcement partners who have been on your side of the fence to make sure that we feel that this is being what's best for overall moving forward.
for the Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention Authority as a whole, and that gives us a little checks and balances to hopefully make everybody in here a little happier.
That's my only comment about that.

Any other discussion?
(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All in favor?
(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?
(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: None. Motion passes.

Now comes the good part.

MR. WILSON: In May of 2018, this Board voted to go forward with a continued appropriation request of $12.8 million, and that appropriation request at that time, since that's what we understood the budget -- this is May of 2018 -- the Appropriation Act said that we had $12.8 million so you asked that the legislature continue $12.8 million. And then you also, since the Sunset was being considered at that time, we asked for $6.6 million in exceptional item requests if the Sunset provision of the law passed, which would have been the number of officers we estimated we needed to implement the Sunset recommendation. Okay? So $6.6 million was what we set as an exceptional item.
Between the time you voted and the time that the LAR was due and submitted to the authorities, the Governor's Office and the LBB, Legislative Budget Board, the Legislative Budget Board came back and said, Well, the DMV appropriation for this category is actually $19.4 million, not $12.8-, and so we need you to submit the budget based on the $19.4-.

And I've got our legislative liaison here in case I say something wrong. I'll watch his face, hopefully it's not too poker. Matthew Miller has been of great assistance to this Board that you'll never know how much work he does on your behalf and helping these law enforcement officials out there. So shake his hand if you get a chance, he's a great guy, former Marine and just an all around great person to help this program out.

But anyway, so they came back and said, Well, you've got $19.4- is what you have to put in your budget. And we're like, okay, come on, quit it, stop, no joking. And they said, No, that's what has to go into the budget. And then the consideration of 2.5 percent increments of cut from 2.5, 5, 7.5 and 10 also got submitted on your behalf.

Well, all of a sudden that changed the dynamic for what we needed the $6.6 million for. So what we did is we've reconfigured our budget and our plan of operation...
on page 92, and when we went back and carefully looked at what we had in our core budget and what we had in our exceptional item, it really doesn't make sense for us to continue the request for $6.6 million. So what I'm asking you to do, and LBB has called me on it and asked me to consider, that given that the new budget is much higher than what we started, they asked me to get you to consider lowering the request for the expansion of the Sunset Commission.

You need to understand that there could be any iteration of things happen. The Sunset Commission bill could pass and they would give us authority but they might add all kinds of things. You know, what was Jeff just talking about, human trafficking. I mean, they can anything related to motor vehicles. We don't know what that bill looks like, but more than likely we think it's going to be something similar to what we asked for the last session which was criminal offenses of the Transportation Code. Is that right, Matthew?

So we think that's what it's going to be, eTAG fraud, title fraud, registration fraud, inspection fraud, those kind of things, odometer rollbacks. There's a few others in there that are probably further away from what we do, but at least the way that we're considering it is we're supposed to be doing a registration program to
prevent vehicles from leaving the United States to Mexico.

We don't do that because we don't have any money to do that. So we would treat it like that, but if they pass the law and they pass the budget, we'll have money to give the task forces to take on all these extra duties.

They could pass the budget and the exceptional item request and not pass the law, I don't know what happens then, but here's the money to do other kinds of work that we don't have any authority to do. I don't know what that translates out to but I think by Board rule we might be able to do some things as related to auto theft and burglary, you know, you can do title fraud, da-da-da-da-da. Jeff gave a couple of good examples just a minute ago, identity fraud, that's burglary of a motor vehicle technically. Right? I mean, it could be, at least the investigation would be ramped that way. So there's some things administratively if we got the money and didn't get it.

So I guess what I'm saying is for right now I'm asking you to respond and lower the request for the exceptional item which is contingent -- well, it's not contingent but it's based on the authorization to expand ABTPA's scope to include other motor vehicle crimes.

MR. HANSEN: And reducing that amount at their request, because they're the ones that also bumped up our
base thing $6.6 million or $6 million, is this puts our
total amount that we're shooting for here, based on if the
legislature cooperates with what's been put on the table,
of a total of about $24-1/2 million. I don't think
anybody in this room has any complaints about that, I hope
not. So we're at a better starting point than I think we
have since the inception of this program a far as the
right people recommending the appropriate amounts of money
that will allow you to expand and go out and do your job
for the citizens of the State of Texas that are paying
their fee on their insurance policies.

So for just discussion before we get into a
vote, I think if the LBB is recommending this massive
increase in our base budget here, for them to say, hey, if
you would cut back on this to kind of round it off to this
number amount, they obviously have a reason for that and
obviously their reason is to our benefit. We don't want
to look greedy here -- although we should be, but we
don't.

Do you want to continue about these other
things in here?

MR. WILSON: Well, I think we should vote on
this one.

MS. HUNTER: I would like to make a motion to
adopt the updated legislative appropriation request for
the fiscal year '20 and fiscal year '21 biennium of $19.5 million per year in continued funding and an exceptional item request of $5 million per year, as presented on page 92 of the board book.

MR. HANSEN: Do we have a second?

MR. MIZANI: I'll second.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Armin.

A motion has been made, seconded to adopt and update the legislative appropriation request for FY20 and FY21 of $19.5 million per year in continued funding and an exceptional item request of $5 million per year, as presented on page 92 of the board book. Is there any other additional discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: Hearing none, all in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. HANSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: The motion passes on number 13.

MR. WILSON: So right now, Chairman, a few other things on the agenda. Like I said, Matt Miller from the Government and Strategic Communications is here. He's our legislative coordinator for DMV, so if you have any questions.

But at this point when the Board voted back in
May of 2018, you said that in years passed we've pursued
lots of legislative cleanups and things like that, this
year we said we're only going to seek a sub-account within
the TxDMV account, and what that does is that while the
legislature can pass any law and do anything it wants, but
if it's in a sub-account of a permanent standing account,
the likelihood that they'll have to go in -- we still
can't spend any money that's not appropriated but they
don't generally go into a major standing account and
remove the money directly.

So, Mr. Mizani, the questions you asked earlier
about the unexpended balance, well, the unexpended balance
authority is the ability to spend that $357-, that's what
we've never had. Right now when we don't spend money,
because it's held in the general fund, it just becomes
invisible. This would at least, from an accounting
perspective, stay in the DMV Fund and you could see the
money even if you had no legal authority to spend it. But
it could accrue over time, as DMV, some of their accounts
as well do, and so you would at least know what the
balance is pending, and it's easier go to the legislature
and say I've got a half a million or a million dollars in
my sub-account, would you authorize me to spend it for
this purpose, and they can do that through both the
Legislative Budget Board process and through the
legislative process.

So thank you, Matt, for shaking your head so I didn't get too far off. Appreciate that.

So really there's nothing to do. I'm informing you that this is the only issue. The chair wanted to at least bring up two other issues for you to consider or not to consider. We don't have prepared motions but I think they're more aspirational, but I'll let the chair take the last two. I'll be glad to explain them.

MR. HANSEN: Well, Matthew, I would like to explain what we just talked about here in words that maybe I understand is that historically our money goes in the GR and the legislature pretty much -- I'm trying to be politically correct here -- can take as they will and appropriate to us what they want. They could still do that to this money in this account but it makes it very clear to anyone doing that of where that money is coming from. Is that a pretty good description? I didn't mean to throw you under the bus.

MR. MILLER: Matthew Miller, Government Relations with DMV.

That's pretty much correct but the one difference from what was pursued last time is that this would have the amount that gets deposited to the DMV fund be the amount that they actually appropriate as opposed to
linking it to the revenue collection, and the goal of that
would be that there would be a zero fiscal impact to that
change. So that would be the only difference.

  MR. HANSEN: But it just makes it very clear
that that money is earmarked for a specific thing. If
they still want to do something with it they can, but
instead of just coming out of the big black hole of GR.

  MR. MILLER: It would.

  MR. HANSEN: It gives the money a name, it
gives the money a name and a face, but when it goes to the
GR it loses all that.

  MR. MILLER: That is correct.

  MR. HANSEN: Is that pretty close?

  MR. MILLER: Pretty close.

  MR. HANSEN: Okay. Just wanted everybody to
understand the purpose of doing this is if they're going
to touch it, everybody is going to know where it came
from.

  MR. WILSON: Any other questions?

  (No response.)

  MR. HANSEN: Sunset, you've already done that.

  MR. WILSON: Well, we have just a quick update.

Are we going to do the Sunset here?

  MR. HANSEN: You can do that now.

  MR. WILSON: Go ahead.
MR. GONZALES: Hello. My name is Dominic Gonzales. I wrote up this summary on the Sunset bills for the 86th Legislative Session.

On August 29, 2018 the Sunset Advisory Commission met to go over the commission decisions regarding the TxDMV as well as ABTPA. There were no changes to the discussion to the ABTPA recommendation to expand ABTPA's scope to include other motor vehicle crimes such as title and odometer fraud, to name a couple. The final step will take place in January when the Sunset Advisory Commission will vote on the final report at the beginning of the 86th Legislative Session, which just began.

MR. WILSON: Hang on, Dominic. I think that took place yesterday. Is that right, Matthew? And it was passed with no change.

MR. HANSEN: That's good.

MR. GONZALES: So DMV and ABTPA agreed with the recommendations to combat a broader range of motor vehicle crimes. During the 85th Legislature we worked with Representative Lucio on a bill to add criminal violations of statutes listed in 1001.002 of the Transportation Code, but that didn't pass. The leg counsel is currently drafting the TxDMV and ABTPA Sunset related legislation; we haven't seen it. The bill created by the legislative
counsel will usually match the results, and once the bill
language is drafted and the sponsors attached, the
legislation follows the same path as any other
legislation.

MR. WILSON: And Matthew and Mr. Richards, does
that come to your offices?

MR. RICHARDS: It will come through there first
and then come to us.

MR. WILSON: So once that bill is written, it
will come to your office and we'll distribute it out to
the members at that point. No?

MR. MILLER: Matthew Miller, DMV Government
Relations.

That bill is controlled by the Sunset process
and it's their bill and they may give us a copy in advance
of being filed, but it would be their decision as to
whether we see it before filing. It's based on what the
Commission recommends only.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. That was an important
distinction.

The last thing that was on here is the agency
name change. There's been a lot of discussion about that
and a lot of it had to do with trying to get the
legislature to recognize the enforcement end of what we
do. I think there was a stigma with a lot of the people
that we spoke with by our name that you're a bunch of cops going to AARP meetings handing out brochures to little old ladies on how not to get their car stolen, and as we well know, yes, you were doing that but you were also putting your stuff on the line every day out there in the field. So we thought maybe a name change would be appropriate.

We came up with several things that were really involving enforcement type names, and the minimum change was a recommendation by one of the key senators of just removing Prevention and replacing that with Enforcement. But our whole goal with that was to get our image out there to get more money appropriated for us, but now based on what's happened with LBB and based on what's happened with Sunset, particularly yesterday -- thankfully, they didn't change anything as far as we were concerned which is a wonderful sign -- we've pretty much come to the conclusion, just speaking to some legislators, that if we're on the right track and we're on this direction for this money, let's leave well enough alone for right now. And I tend to want to agree with that.

Senator Bettencourt is who we spoke to, from Houston. If he decides he wants to do the Enforcement versus Prevention, that's pretty minor, we'll leave that up to Senator Bettencourt. But I think as far as an overall complete overhaul, there was a reason behind it
and right now I don't see that we need to put any more out there than we need to. We need to stay on the radar. They got our money out there, let that take its flow. So I just wanted to kind of give an update on the thought process behind that.

Anything else under number 13?

MR. WILSON: No, sir.

MR. HANSEN: Anybody else have any other questions or discussion?

(No response.)

MR. HANSEN: All right. The director's report, Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: We'll be passing it around very quickly. Everybody knows they have their five seconds or less -- I'm joking. They were giving me a hard time because they think I'm a little demanding on getting that report done, but this time everybody is ready to go home.

So Dan will go ahead and do the budget real quick, and do we still have Sheila here? No, we lost Sheila.

MR. PRICE: My name is Dan Price. Once again, I'm the ABTPA grant auditor. We're looking at page 100 at the moment. Now that you all have approved the budget, we can tell you how we've been spending it.

(General laughter.)
MR. PRICE: So the upper block, this was prepared on December 20 and the upper block is AY 2019. Once again, you had previously approved the obligation of the grants for 2019, so those have been obligated. We have not begun paying those yet although the expenditure reports were due and are being turned in as we speak.

The bottom block is AY 2018 where we're winding up and one thing that I was asked to highlight on this is there's two numbers on here that might be a little confusing. The first one is under projected obligations and encumbrances. Under grants we have the $2.1 million that shows that that hasn't been paid. In fact, part of that is for three payments that at the time this was prepared were remaining to be paid for Q4 obligations. Some of the money was brought forward, which Mr. Mizani was talking about earlier, $1.15 million was brought into Q1 from the '18 year, and so that money, those bills are just coming in as we speak. The remaining amount of money on there is the money we spoke of at the beginning of the meeting where folks have underspent just a little bit and of that amount about $325,000 on page 58 is where we believe we will come in for folks underspending the money on Q4 final 2018.

The $31,000 on page 58 would equate to the $31,000 on the right-hand side there which are pretty much
administrative costs that we have underspent and were able to return that money to the budget for these other special items that we've talked about previously.

Are there any questions on that page?

(No response.)

MR. PRICE: Okay. So I'm going to flip over to the next page. We have a requirement to report our statutory spending for border and port designations that were earmarked as part of our appropriation. The FY final estimate -- we've got one or two more payments, once again, that are pending right now -- should come out to be $5,115,063.84. This is on page 101. The amount that was appropriated per year for the biennium was $2.8 million. We had earmarked or budgeted $5.250 million for border and port, and then the breakdown for the border and port are on the right there. Now, once again, the numbers will look like they don't add up because the City of Brownsville is both border and port, and so that number is listed twice; you just need to account for that if you're trying to combine them.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Dan.

So just some of the things that have to take place over the next few weeks, especially if we get to put in our plan of operation. I sent out the plan of operation and it was submitted to the legislature back in
December. Every member of the legislature, they have a new process this year for distributing that report and both the House and the Senate set up a process to notify. So we worked through the plan of operation, that page that we were just looking at a few minutes ago, the blue page to reduce the exceptional item was the budget page out of that plan of operation. That is our official standard.

One of the items is to cover the part of the state in our core funding, so I have been trying to set up meetings with -- we say in that plan of operation on page 103, we have large swaths of the state where we have no coverage for ABTPA and I'll be reaching out through our stakeholders, Sheriffs' Association, Chiefs of Police Association to try to set up meetings to get them on board to apply for new grants so that if we do get all the funding some of that money will have to go to expanding our coverage areas.

We've looked at border security development. On page 104, just high level you can see -- except for where I messed up that one red dot north of Brewster County -- all that white area and then below Laredo is not covered, yet we're being asked to do border security. So there needs to be conversations about how, when, who to set up a task force. We do have a statutory requirement
that we have it fully funded in years, and certainly
Laredo, Brownsville and some of those areas are taking
care of it the best they can, but we do have a statutory
requirement to prevent vehicles from entering Mexico from
the United States. So that is part of our strategy in the
plan of operation.

Some of the excerpts, I'm certainly not going
to read it to you, but I just want to remind you that part
of the plan of operation that we discussed over the last
several years is adding prosecutors, on page 105, and the
description of that is largely out of the plan of
operation. And also, DMV has also added a CID, a Criminal
Investigation Division that we would work closely and help
coordinate prosecutors through that office, especially if
the Sunset grants us -- or the legislature grants us
expanded authority.

One of the proposals that I've learned over the
last several years of attending and working with
automotive cybersecurity -- and the City of Dallas
especially but others, Dallas is fixing to release a
video, a law enforcement video that they helped
coordinate. But we really don't have full time technology
experts implanted in our task forces. We're not asking
for the world but we do want to try to get and encourage
at least seven full time technology experts that are also
law enforcement personnel.

I've met with the cybersecurity regional director for FBI. He's on board, he thinks it's a great idea. And of course, the government is shut down now but I sent him this draft document for him to look at whenever he gets back around to responding to email.

So that's all I have. Are there any questions about our plan of operation and some of the things that I'm working on to promote ABTPA in new areas?

MR. HANSEN: I don't.

MR. WILSON: Okay. I'll turn it over to Mary Dominguez for the grant reports information, statutory measures.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: For the record, my name is Mary Dominguez and I'm a grant coordinator for the Automobile Burglary and Theft Prevention Authority.

On page 108 there is snapshot of the FY17 and 18 statutory requirements that are reported by the grant recipients and that is required by statute that the grantees track this information.

In FY18 there was an increase of recovered stolen vehicles and persons arrested, and we saw a slight decrease on motor vehicle theft cases cleared. Two areas that I would like to highlight is the motor vehicle burglary cases. We did go down significantly, 41 percent,
and also on arrests. That was based on there are some agencies that are no longer doing motor vehicle burglary operations.

Is there any questions?

MR. HANSEN: When you're saying agencies are not doing it, are you speaking of task force agencies?

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Task force agencies due to shifts in personnel.

MR. HANSEN: Right.

MR. WILSON: So pretty much with the $2.5 million contraction, we had a contraction, and what I think is going on based on the reports that we're getting in the GMTS system is that we have limited resources so we're going to have to just work auto theft because that's our agency priority. Remember these are state funds provided to the local jurisdictions for their priorities, so they have to work on burglary and auto theft but they get to choose their priority that fits their local needs.

That's the point of these kind of grants.

So I'll move on. Another thing we learned, again, this is just an example, but Dan, go ahead and cover page 109.

MR. PRICE: This is Dan Price again, ABTPA grant auditor.

So with the new GMTS system we are collecting
data and those data are going into tables, and these two are just examples of some of the information that's available to us. So overall as an ask, one of the things we would like the Board to think about are other types of reporting, like you had talked earlier about maybe some analysis of insurance folks and how they're doing on their payments. But if you can think of any statistics that you would like to see during the grant application process or just as your oversight as the Board, we're happy to produce that.

But let me give you an idea here on a couple of the things that we did. To the point made earlier about being starved for other funds, there was a discussion back in 2016 during the budgeting process and that recognized really that the most difficult asset for us to acquire is a trained investigator. An investigator can take up to two years to train just to get up to speed. The amount of cost and time involved is just enormous. If you lose that investigator, you're not going to be able to go and get one back tomorrow, that investigator is gone. So a decision was taken that we needed to try and emphasize more on retaining personnel.

So the question came up during the preparation for this meeting: How did we do, were we able to retain those investigators or did we lose them? And so we did
this quick analysis and the system basically said you lost a net of one investigator, law enforcement officer, during the period of time from 2016 to 2019. There are other little anomalies in the data that would affect that a little bit. One of those is that we've been encouraging folks to report all of their expenses and all of the asset and resources that are being used on a grant so that we can have a better idea of what we're actually doing for the state. So one of the grantees actually reported five additional in-kind folks that they're paying for that were not previously reported.

So the reality of it is we probably lost about six law enforcement investigators due to the budget cuts and other issues, but we've been overall successful in our objective of retaining trained investigators from 2016 to 2019, and this was just a real easy way to demonstrate that.

The second discussion that came up, once again back in the 2016 era, we were looking at the age of the fleet and the age of the vehicles and we were also looking at the blend of leasing versus procured vehicles. And some actions were taken to try and restrict the amount of money spent on leasing. We are unable to allow people to obligate funds for more than the grant year, so that makes it difficult for them to even sign a one year lease. By
the time the money is approved, usually it's too late. So
a lot of folks were doing one month rentals which are
enormously more expensive than say a one or a two year
lease.

But we are able to determine, for example, the
average age of the fleet, we can tell you by a given
grantee how old their particular vehicles are, and in this
example what we did was we looked at the entire population
of the fleet that ABTPA maintains on its inventory plus
the leased vehicles, and we're able to tell you just real
quick that we have 24 vehicles designated as bait, five as
administrative, eight are undisclosed or other, we have a
dozen that are either spares or floaters -- now we'll get
back to that in a second -- there are 15 specialty
vehicles. We have a couple of ATVs where people have
taken cars out to a swamp and sunk them and the ATVs are
used to go and find those vehicles, as an example. We
have 194 that are currently assigned to our law
enforcement officers, and we have 235 law enforcement
officers, so some of those floaters are being distributed,
people are sharing basically. You may have two different
law enforcement officers that are sharing one vehicle. So
we have a total of 258 vehicles currently being reported
in the ABTPA inventory, and once again, this number can be
produced pretty much on demand any time anybody wants it
as to what is it today.

Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you. That supports what Mr. Hale said earlier about equipment and vehicles. Thank you.

MR. WILSON: The next item would be FY18 closeout on budget adjustments from Mary Dominguez.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: This is Mary Dominguez.

On page 111 and 112 we have a snapshot of the FY18 grant adjustments report. We had a total of 34 adjustments submitted, 22 were budget, ten were program/scope adjustments, two were program and budget adjustments, and six were denied. I just want to bring to your attention that in the book it says four but there was actually six. One was Corpus Christi was denied before the publication of this book.

MR. WILSON: Do you want to go ahead and do FY19 grant adjustments so far?

MS. DOMINGUEZ: We go to FY19 on page 113, we have a total of seven grant adjustments. There were four budget changes, two program changes, and there was one budget and program change.

MR. WILSON: Just a reminder that this is what I do on your behalf under state law and according to the Uniform Grant Management Standards. When the contract is
set by you after you've reviewed the application, a budget adjustment is a change in the contract. There are limits, and any time I think it exceeds my authority, I consult with legal counsel and then we bring it back to the Board. But every once in a while, again I use Montgomery County, they just wanted to add a coverage jurisdiction. Well, it didn't cost us anything, it didn't change anything, but you do need to be able to report to the legislature we just added Angelina County to our network. So those are the kind of things I want you to know that we're doing on your behalf.

Part D, I'll call on Mr. Dominic Gonzales to talk about what we've tried to do on public education and awareness.

MR. GONZALES: Hello. This is Dominic Gonzales, grant coordinator.

I just want to highlight some of the major activities that we undertook as staff for the educational programs and public education. That is one of the statutory requirements of ABTPA, and as we discussed earlier, we used to have a much larger budget which has decreased due to budget cuts.

This year we did receive a proclamation from the Governor's Office for Watch Your Car Month. That was very important for showing support throughout the entire
state, the governor's support for our work. It was also important in sharing that with our task force members so they could obtain their own local proclamations. And so an image of that is provided in the book.

We coordinated with the national organization that has organized National Night Out and they gave us permission to use their visual assets and their logos for the 35th anniversary of National Night Out. Across the country these activities usually take place in August but in Texas, because of the heat, many communities use October for National Night Out, the first Tuesday in October, I believe. And so we posted this on the TxDMV website, we provided it to our task forces, and we tried to coordinate activities. We also sent out material upon request, promotional items and educational material to local communities that wanted to use ABTPA assets in their National Night Out activities.

We secured the rights to images and developed a campaign for a holiday alert and we released that November 2018. This was placed on the TxDMV website for statewide dissemination. We also provided these visual assets to all of the task forces so that we could coordinate our message and make sure that motorists throughout the state understood that they had a role to play in protecting their vehicles and protecting their gifts during the
holiday season.

There is a chart that shows the amount of promotional material that ABTPA staff shipped out to grant recipient and to other stakeholders. We use our mailing logs to track this.

The governor’s proclamation is on page 117. Page 118 is an example of the tracking that we do of the activities that the task forces undertake for their own educational activities and promotions, and so page 118 describes all of the task forces and the targets that they set for themselves and the amount of totals that they actually reached related to conducting public awareness related activities and conducting training activities for other law enforcement agencies.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Dominic.

So as we talked earlier, we're trying to improve our operations related to the way we collect the funds and also the way we provide you information about the refund determinations that you make, so on page 120, Dan, go ahead and take that one.

MR. PRICE: Just real quickly. This is Dan Price again, ABTPA grant auditor.

Just real quickly, as we discussed earlier, more and more folks are indicating that they're making duplicate payments on behalf of another entity. In order
to be crystal clear, we've added a request for the Comptroller's ID number so that we know exactly which other identity they're saying has made the payment. A lot of the insurance companies have similar names and to make sure there is no confusion.

We also want clarification that if they're asserting duplicate payments were made, we want proof of both payments up front rather than having to go back and ask for it. That will speed the process along.

And then the last thing is that we used to require them to file an amended return with the Comptroller before we would consider their request, and what we found is that the Comptroller's systems are not really quite designed for the ABTPA process, we're actually utilizing their systems as best we can with what they have. So what was happening was they would send the amended returns in to the Comptroller's Office and every once in a while one of them would escape. A processor would get it, they wouldn't understand quite what it was, and they would go ahead and process it and the refund would go ahead and be made without our prior approval. So this way they're now going to send those amended returns to us, and once the Board has approved the refund, we will go ahead and submit them to the Comptroller on their behalf. The form is on the next page, and that's it for
MR. WILSON: We'll skip the next item, Mr. Chairman. We've already talked about the Sunset.

MS. MENOSKEY: Hello. My name is Mary Menoskey. I'm going to brief you on the investigator trainings that we've held so far for fiscal year '18 and '19.

In '18 we have had three trainings. We had them in Dallas, San Marcos and San Antonio. We've already held two for fiscal year '19, we held those in Galveston and Houston earlier this year. And then we have the first advanced course that was held that was held in Fort Worth. That was our first one that we have held. And we did not have the DMV TCOLE training committee, they were not able to approve it at that time, so the Tarrant County Task Force handled the TCOLE for that, but luckily in December we were able to get that approved so now we can take over the advance course and start doing all of the TCOLE paperwork that comes involved with holding the training.

We plan to have one more advanced this year; that will be in Humble in April, it's already scheduled. And we're looking to have possibly two more intermediate trainings, maybe one early summer, one early fall, just depending how many people sign up for that.

And then we also worked with NICB for what we
called the auto theft analyst and investigative assistant training. It was basically a 3-1/2 hour course on ISO claims search. Those were held at the DPS. They are hosting it for us because they have the computer training center, which we do not have here, because they have to use computers for this course. The DPS took up half the seats and we took up the other half, and we sent 22 students to these classes. We plan to have one maybe in the next couple of months, and one more to finish up. The first one that was held was held during TAVTI so we didn't have as much participation because they were at the TAVTI conference, so we want to get one more in to get anyone who missed it.

And that's where we stand.

MR. HANSEN: That's the analyst training you're talking about?

MR. WILSON: Correct.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mary.

MR. WILSON: I'll go ahead and do these next two real quick. So one of the things that was an audit finding back in 2014 was that the agency, specifically staff had not monitored the comprehensive annual financial review required by state law by any entity receiving at that time I think it was around $500,000, now it's $750-.

I just wanted to let you know we're keeping up with that.
You know, sometimes you get away from something that happened four years ago and you say, well, okay. But I want you to remember we're still paying attention, or you to know that we're still paying attention.

Every one of those, Mary Dominguez did most of them, I think Dominic has done some, but we were listed as a specific program income on the financial -- I'm sorry -- as a grant on 12 of the 24 that we reviewed for this time period, which is 2017, the last closed period. We'll start getting new ones here. We had some findings on those grants for those cities or counties that had findings of deficiencies as far as internal controls. Some of them had IT user accounts and things like that, so it's comprehensive, it really means the entire city government transaction system. But none of those were identified as harming our funds or putting our funds at risk of loss or misuse. And then the final thing is that we take these, even those finding that don't affect us, we take that into consideration when we decide to go do a monitoring.

Now, on the monitoring, we didn't do any monitoring in FY18. We were so busy and swamped trying to build our GMTS and our data tracking system, but I do want you to know I've finished the checklist, we're going to try a new model of checklist, it's based similar to our...
old version. One of the problems we had two years ago when we did 12 monitoring visits, the visit is easy but writing the report for the findings is really, really hard and time-consuming when you have grant applications and everything else to do. So trying to make it more of a checklist. Right now I've already submitted that to Internal Audit Division at DMV for their input and comments, and then we'll start executing that over the next several months and working to implement that process.

But we do have much better data than we had three years ago when we were trying to build it at that time.

And that concludes the director's report. I appreciate your patience and time.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Wilson and staff.

Mr. Richards, I don't think we have anything for executive session?

MR. RICHARDS: No, sir.

MR. HANSEN: Thank God. No actions.

Last but not least, public comment Reid Stacy.

Reid is the immediate past president of TAVTI, Dallas PD.

MR. STACY: Reid Stacy with Dallas PD. I appreciate your time and I applaud you guys on your energy, your effort. Any time the LBB and the Sunset come back with positive shining stars, that's on you guys.

Everything y'all do is for us and we appreciate that.
As a Dallas police officer, last year I was also the president of TAVTI, the Texas Association of Vehicle Theft Investigators, and in that short year -- and it was a short year, it flew by -- I felt like I was kind of that guy that was in a forest fire, you've just got to run, run, run, you never stop. Right? And now that my time has lapsed and I'm past president, I kind of can reflect back of some of the things that I knew that needed to be challenged or dealt with, just didn't have the time.

And one of the main things that I had asked of myself to address was -- as president you're also part of the South Central Regional Chapter of IAATI, the Internal Association of Auto Theft Investigators, and of that we're a five member chapter, it's us, Texas, and then of course we have Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma and New Mexico. And during all these years of being part of TAVTI, I've also kind of noticed that our membership base, we're about 95 percent of the members, which we're a large state, we're a large population, we carry a lot more auto theft crimes.

But at the same time, I know that our sister states around us are key members with us combating auto theft because if it's a vehicle it can be driven across state just like it can be driven across the border. And too many times in Texas I was calling Louisiana or Arkansas and not really having the successes I had hoped.
reaching out to other investigators because their time is short, their resources are short, but also their knowledge is short, and that's where I found more trouble is their overall knowledge in the auto theft industry or the auto theft gangs. And trends that we have up in Dallas I know will eventually be over there in Arkansas and Louisiana, especially on the VIN switching and cloning of vehicles.

With that said, I know that training is a very large expense on departments and agencies, and last year I utilized Fred Lohmann with NICB, he basically championed us training in Louisiana and Arkansas. NICB already has a budget and they were able to reallocate some of their training in those other states.

In this past year I've had conversations with Bryan and also with Dominic to ask, and now I'm standing before the Board, is if TAVTI set up our annual conference in a sister state, be it Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma or New Mexico, one of those states, every four to five years, would the Board have an issue with a lot of your grantees going to training. The grantees at that training would still be receiving certified training, he's still furthering his knowledge, but it's also strengthening us as Texas investigators. You know, if I'm in El Paso, the stronger that New Mexico investigators are, it's going to strengthen El Paso also. No different in Lubbock or
Amarillo with the Oklahoma panhandle.

I know I asked Bryan specifically and he always said he can't give that information but what I'm asking you guys is to come together collectively and see if in a small session y'all could talk about it. I understand that it's up to the grantee to write in training, and that would be no issue, the grantees themselves would have the funds allocated, but what the issue was is if he says I'm going to Shreveport in whenever, whatever year that that conference is in Shreveport, that it was going to be accepted and not declined, just solely because it was in Shreveport versus Dallas.

And the underlying issue is a lot of times we're about two years in advance. We sign contracts two years in advance so we would have to know, okay, there's not going to be any issue with the training in 2020 in Shreveport if we wanted to go there because some of the actual members wouldn't be declined just solely because it's an out-of-state conference.

At no time would we ever look to do that every year, maybe about every third or every fourth year. Inside Texas we train investigators all day long, we have Part I, Part II, we have Advanced, we have our annual conference. NICB has upwards of five to six trainings, but then you go to those outlying states and they have
zero, until now Fred Lohmann and NICB started training.

So that's why I see the necessity to get our investigators, get our knowledge in those outlying states. And we all know if I meet you and I speak to you and I ask you for help, you help me. So the camaraderie, the friendship is just a lot stronger. As a five person family, if one person is strong and the other four are weak, the whole family is weak, but if everybody can carry their part, it benefits us all.

So in short, just to wrap up, I understand it's Texas taxpayer funds but those Texas law enforcement officers are coming back to work in Texas even if they're gone for the four or five days.

Thank you, guys.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Reid.

This may be something, Linda, that the Education and Legislative Committee might look at and come back with recommendations to approve it. I agree with it. I mean, it's right across the border. It would be different if they were going across the country, but that's not the case.

Do we have any other comments? Nothing anybody else needs to sign up? Any Board members, any other comments at the end of the day?

(No response.)
MR. HANSEN: Then I'd like to end with number one, everybody keep in your thoughts. Again, I don't know what 2019 is going to look like but we've already had two or three officers shot and killed in just the last 24 hours in this country. That's unacceptable.

As far as our business is concerned, as y'all know, we've got a new speaker of the house yesterday. I can tell you that in the past speaker we had little or zero communications with him. I'll just leave it at that.

The new speaker is very pro law enforcement, he's from Brazoria County which is an area served by one of our task forces. One of his new chiefs of staff going over there is a gentleman that we've worked with very closely through the years, Mr. Oscar Garza, with several other senators, and he's very in tune with what every one of you do, so that's going to be good.

I can't stress enough as we move forward that everyone in here needs to work with our legislators, and particularly once the appointments are made on House Appropriations and Senate Finance are finalized, those are going to be our key people.

And I personally would like to give extraordinary thanks to the DMV and ABTPA staff, and thank you for the task forces. Guys, we've had a large couple of years with our money and you look at the stats that
Mary gave out a little while ago, and if you look at the number of vehicles stolen in the state and look at the number recovered just by this small elite group, it's phenomenal, it's phenomenal. And I think more and more of the legislators are beginning to recognize that, thank God, for a change. And safe travels.

So do we have a motion for adjournment?

MS. HUNTER: I make a motion that we adjourn.

MR. HANSEN: Ms. Hunter.

Do we have a second? No? I guess we have to stay.

(General laughter.)

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.

MR. HANSEN: You've got to be quick.

All right, guys. Thank you very much. Have safe travels.

(Whereupon, at 12:17 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)
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