

**ITEM REDUCTIONS BY METHOD OF FINANCING**  
 81st Regular Session, 2010-11 Item Reductions  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas(ABEST)

Date: 2/12/2010  
 Time: 8:22:56AM  
 Page: 1 of 2

Agency code: 352

Agency name: **Bond Review Board**

Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing	2010	2011	Biennial Total	Target
---	------	------	----------------	--------

**1 IT-BRB Database Conversion**

**Item Comment:** The Bond Review Board requests that \$5,000 be added back in FY2010 and \$5,000 for FY2011. These costs are split between the agency's 1.1.1 Review Bond Issues (FY10 -\$1,250 – FY11-\$1,250), 1.1.2 State Bond Debt (FY10-\$1,250 – FY11-\$1,250), 2.1.1 Analyze Local Bond Debt (FY10-\$1,250 – FY11-\$1,250), and (3.1.1) Administer Private Activity Bond (FY10-\$1,250 – FY11-\$1,250).

**Project:** Update databases for all three functions of the BRB in a separate phase for each function: State, PAB and Local Government. The agency's internal databases and web databases were originally designed by in-house staff at the time the agency was established in 1987. They have since been updated in a piecemeal process over the years rather than as one cohesive project. This has led to inefficiencies in data collection, verification, management and reporting.

**Project Advantages:** The BRB databases need to be updated to Microsoft Access 2007 with its enhanced features that include: 1) the use of value lists at the time of data entry allowing users to make specific selections for repetitive information; 2) the ability to capture data received electronically from issuers (by e-mail or online web forms) thus reducing the potential for errors and improving staff efficiency; and 3) the ability to have a consolidated database that holds all data necessary for data collection, analysis and reporting so that database queries can be run, stored and rerun as needed without the inefficiencies of recreating a new run for repeated queries.

**Project Goal:** Improved overall database design to ensure data integrity and improve staff efficiency and response time for information requests from BRBs customers, Board members and State officials.

The impact of not restoring the agency's budget would compromise agency efficiency of data collection, analysis and reporting as required by statute.

**GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS**

1 General Revenue Fund	\$5,000	\$5,000	
<b>General Revenue Funds Total</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	
<b>Item Total</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	

**2 Staff Merit Increases**

\* - Indicates amount does not meet target requirements.

**ITEM REDUCTIONS BY METHOD OF FINANCING**  
 81st Regular Session, 2010-11 Item Reductions  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Date: 2/12/2010  
 Time: 8:23:02AM  
 Page: 2 of 2

Agency code: 352

Agency name: **Bond Review Board**

<b>Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>Biennial Total</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Item Comment:</b> The Bond Review Board meets or exceeds performance measures and receives positive reviews in audits and external customer surveys For the agency to maintain its high level of service to state leadership, state issuers and the financial community, the Bond Review Board requests that \$19,501.62 be added back in FY2010 and \$31,752.43 for FY2011. These costs are split between the agency's three strategies: 1.1.1 Review Bond Issues (FY10 - \$5,460.46 - FY11-\$9,170.68), 1.1.2 State Bond Debt (FY10 -\$4,290.36 - FY11-\$7,205.54), 2.1.1 Analyze Local Bond Debt (FY10-\$4,875.41 - FY11-\$8,188.11) and 3.1.1 Administer Private Activity Bonds (FY10-\$4,875.39 - FY11-\$7,188.10).				
The BRB remains focused on its most important assets, its employees. The agency realizes the need for a highly skilled and versatile workforce to provide continued quality service to its customers. Awarding merits to employees for high productivity and exemplary job performance is integral to retaining a professional and highly qualified staff. Based on historical trends, the BRB expects to continue to experience a turnover rate in key staff of 30-35 percent over the next four years. Turnover is costly and results in significant work flow inefficiencies, particularly in a small agency with limited opportunities for crosstraining. Without experienced backup for key positions, turnover results in a significant investment of managerial time for recruiting and subsequent training for key staff, a process that requires a minimum of two years				
The impact of not restoring the agency's budget would 1) compromise agency efficiency;2), the quality of its analysis and reports; 3) its ability to maintain exemplary customer service and 4) its ability to retain a tenured staff that has specialized public finance knowledge and analytical skills				
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS</b>				
1 General Revenue Fund	\$19,502	\$31,752		
<b>General Revenue Funds Total</b>	<b>\$19,502</b>	<b>\$31,752</b>		
<b>Item Total</b>	<b>\$19,502</b>	<b>\$31,752</b>		
<b>Agency General Revenue Total</b>	<b>\$24,502</b>	<b>\$36,752</b>		
<b>Agency GR Dedicated Total</b>				
<b>Agency Grand Total</b>	<b>\$24,502</b>	<b>\$36,752</b>	<b>\$61,254</b>	<b>\$61,254</b>

\* - Indicates amount does not meet target requirements.