

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT..... 141

APPENDIX B: BROADBAND OFFERINGS BY COUNTY 147

APPENDIX C: TELECOMMUNICATIONS TIMELINE 159

APPENDIX D: FINANCIAL INDICATORS OF MAJOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES 165

APPENDIX E: NOTABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BANKRUPTCY FILINGS 167

APPENDIX F: STATUS OF LONG-DISTANCE ENTRY APPLICATIONS 171

APPENDIX G: SUMMARY OF TIF GRANTS..... 175

 Public School175

 Higher Education 181

 Library.....183

 Health Care188

 Discovery191

 Community Networking193

 Special Projects.....194

 Legislative Appropriations.....201

APPENDIX H: TRANSMISSION LINE SITING PROCESS 203

APPENDIX I: TBPC PROPOSED STATUTORY CHANGES 207

**APPENDIX A:
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT**

A

ADA	Average Daily Attendance
AeA	American Electronics Association
AR	At Risk
Art.	Article
ATM	Asynchronous Transfer Mode
AWG	American Wire Gauge

B

BRI	Basic Rate Interface, the residential ISDN offering
-----	---

C

CC	Common Carrier Bureau of the FCC; also community college
CCCN	Coleman County Community Network
CCD	Community College District
CCN	Certificate of Convenience and Necessity
CCTS	Capitol Complex Telephone System
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
CD-ROM	Compact Disc-Read Only Memory
Cir.	Circuit
CIRA	County Information Resources Agency
CISD	Consolidated Independent School District
CLEC	Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
CMRS	Commercial Mobile Radio Service (wireless and paging services)
CN	Community Networking Grant
Co.	County
Coll.	College
CSU	Channel Service Unit

D

D	Democrat
DBS	Direct Broadcast Satellite
D.C.	District of Columbia
DDC	Disaster District Committee

DEM	Division of Emergency Management
DI	Discovery Grant
DIR	Department of Information Resources
DNS	Domain Name System
DPS	Texas Department of Public Safety
DSL	Digital Subscriber Line
DSLAM	Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer

E

EAD	Encoded Archival Description
ED	Economically Disadvantaged
ENA	Education Networks of America
EOY	End of Fiscal Year
ERCOT	Electric Reliability Council of Texas
ESC	Education Service Center
ESF	Emergency Support Function
est.	Estimate

F

FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FTE	Full-time Equivalent

G

GSC	General Services Commission
-----	-----------------------------

H

HAN	Health Alert Network
HC	Health Care Grant
HE	Higher Education Grant
HEB	Hurst-Euless-Bedford
HFC	Hybrid Fiber-Coaxial
HFPL	High Frequency Portion of the Loop
HHSCN	Health and Human Services Consolidated Network
HNS	Hughes Network Systems
H.R.	House Resolution, in the U.S. Congress
HR	Human Resources
HTML	Hypertext Markup Language

http Hypertext Transport Protocol
HUB Historically Underutilized Business

I

I2 Internet2
IBP Internet Backbone Provider
ICS Incident Command System
IEP Integrated Economic Partnerships
ILEC Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
IP Internet Protocol
ISD Independent School District
ISDN Integrated Services Digital Network
ISP Internet Service Provider
IT Information Technology
IXC Interexchange Carrier

K

K Kindergarden
kbps Kilobits per second

L

La. Louisiana
LAN Local Area Network
LATA Local Access and Transport Area
LB Library Grant
LCRA Lower Colorado River Authority
LFA Local Franchising Authority
LRIC Long Run Incremental Cost

M

Mbps Megabits per second
MHMR Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation
Mich. Michigan
MSA Metropolitan Statistical Area
MSE Multi-State Entity
MW Megawatt

N

NCTA	National Cable and Telecommunications Association
NECA	National Exchange Carrier Association
NGA	National Governors Association
NGDLC	Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier
NID	Network Interface Device
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

O

OAG	Office of the Attorney General
Okla.	Oklahoma
OOM	Out of Merit Order
ORCA	Office of Rural Community Affairs

P

PBX	Private Branch Exchange
PH	Public Health Grant
P. L.	Public Law
POTS	Plain Old Telephone Service
PRI	Primary Rate Interface, a type of ISDN often used by ISPs
Proc. R.	Procedural Rule
PS	Public School Grant
PUC	Public Utility Commission of Texas
PURA	Public Utility Regulatory Act
PV	Relative Property Value

R

R	Republican
RBOC	Regional Bell Operating Company (BellSouth, Qwest, SBC, and Verizon)
Rep.	Representative
RFF	Request for Funds
RFP	Request for Proposal
RSAC	Regional State Advisory Committee
RT	Remote Terminal
RTO	Regional Transmission Organization

S

S.	Senate Bill, in the U.S. Congress
S&P	Standard and Poor's

SAO	State Auditor’s Office
SBEC	State Board for Education Certification
S. Car.	South Carolina
S. Ct.	U.S. Supreme Court
S/C	Student to Computer Ratio
Sec.	Section
SEC	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
SGML	Standard Generalized Markup Language
SPS	Southwestern Public Service Company
St.	State
Subst. R.	Substantive Rule
S.W.	

T

TALHO	Texas Association of Local Health Officials
TCET	Texas Cener for Education Technology
TCTA	Texas Cable and Telecommunications Association
TBPC	Texas Building and Procurement Commission
TDED	Texas Department of Economic Development
TDH	Texas Department of Health
TDLA	Texas Digital Library Alliance
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TETN	Texas Education Telecommunications Network
TEX-AN	Texas Agency Network
THEnet	Texas Higher Education Network
TIF	Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund
TIPI	Telecommunications and Information Policy Institute at the University of Texas-Austin
TLA	Texas Library Association
TLC	Texas Library Connection
TLETS	Texas Law Enforcement Telecommunications System
TML	Texas Municipal League
TPBEN	Texas Public Broadcasting Education Network
TPFA	Texas Public Finance Authority
TPG	Telecommunications Planning Group, was replaced by TPOC
TPOC	Telecommunications Planning and Oversight Council
TPPA	Texas Public Power Association
TSLAC	Texas State Library and Archives Commission
TSP	Transmission Service Provider
TSTCI	Texas Statewide Telephone Cooperative, Inc.
TTA	Texas Telephone Association
TTVN	Trans Texas Videoconference Network
TUSF	Texas Universal Service Fund

U

UNE	Unbundled Network Element
Univ.	University
UNT	University of North Texas
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.	United States Code
UT	University of Texas

V

Va.	Virginia
VCR	Videocassette Recorder

W

WAN	Wide Area Network
W.D.	Western District

X

XML	Extensible Markup Language
-----	----------------------------

**APPENDIX B:
BROADBAND OFFERINGS BY COUNTY**

Broadband providers were asked to submit a list of municipalities in which they offer retail broadband Internet access, retail ISDN service, or have Internet points of presence, as of September 1, 2002. This appendix summarizes self-reported broadband service offerings by county. For each city listed, a ☉ indicates that there is at least one cable modem service provider offering retail services within the city’s boundaries, and a ☎ indicates that there is at least one DSL provider.

This list does not represent the full availability of broadband in Texas. It does not include the locations of service offerings from companies that did not voluntarily provide data to the committee, and it excludes fixed wireless and satellite operators. In other ways, this list may overstate broadband availability. The presence of a service within a municipality does not mean that every citizen or business within that municipality has access to any broadband service.

Municipalities that occupy territory in more than county are listed under each county, regardless of whether a particular service is available in each part of the municipality. The population of each county, according to the 2000 census, is listed under each county name. A ★ after a municipality indicates that it is the county seat.

<p>Anderson 55,109</p> <p>Frankston ☎</p> <p>Palestine★ ☎</p>	<p>Archer 8,854</p> <p>Archer City★ ☎</p> <p>Scotland ☎</p> <p>Windthorst ☎</p>	<p>Bailey 6,594</p> <p>Bula ☎</p> <p>Muleshoe★ ☎</p>
<p>Andrews 13,004</p> <p>None reported</p>	<p>Armstrong 2,148</p> <p>None reported</p>	<p>Bandera 17,645</p> <p>Lakehills ☉</p>
<p>Angelina 80,130</p> <p>Burke ☉</p> <p>Central ☎</p> <p>Diboll ☉ ☎</p> <p>Hudson ☉ ☎</p> <p>Lufkin★ ☉ ☎</p>	<p>Atascosa 36,628</p> <p>None reported</p>	<p>Bastrop 57,733</p> <p>Bastrop★ ☉ ☎</p> <p>Elgin ☉</p> <p>Smithville ☉</p>
<p>Aransas 22,497</p> <p>Rockport★ ☎</p>	<p>Austin 23,590</p> <p>Industry ☎</p> <p>New Ulm ☎</p> <p>San Felipe ☎</p>	<p>Baylor 4,093</p> <p>None reported</p>

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

<p>Bee 32,359</p> <p>Beeville★ ⊙ ☎</p>	<p>Blanco 8,418</p> <p>Blanco ⊙</p>	<p>Briscoe 1,790</p> <p>Quitaque ☎</p>
<p>Bell 237,974</p> <p>Belton★ ☎</p> <p>Fort Hood ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Harker Heights ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Killeen ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Little River ☎</p> <p>Nolanville ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Temple ⊙ ☎</p>	<p>Borden 729</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Bosque 17,204</p> <p>Clifton ☎</p> <p>Laguna Park ☎</p> <p>Bowie 89,306</p> <p>Nash ⊙</p> <p>New Boston ☎</p> <p>Red Lick ⊙</p> <p>Texarkana ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Wake Village ⊙</p>	<p>Brooks 7,976</p> <p>Encino ☎</p> <p>Brown 37,674</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Burleson 16,470</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Burnet 34,147</p> <p>None reported</p>
<p>Bexar 1,392,931</p> <p>Alamo Heights ⊙</p> <p>Balcones Heights ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Brooks AFB ⊙</p> <p>Castle Hills ⊙</p> <p>China Grove ⊙</p> <p>Converse ⊙</p> <p>Fair Oaks Ranch ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Fort Sam Houston ⊙</p> <p>Grey Forest ⊙</p> <p>Helotes ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Hill Country Village ⊙</p> <p>Hollywood Park ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Kelly AFB ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Kirby ⊙</p> <p>Lackland AFB ⊙</p> <p>Leon Springs ⊙</p> <p>Leon Valley ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Live Oak ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Olmos Park ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Randolph AFB ⊙</p> <p>San Antonio★ ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Schertz ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Selma ☎</p> <p>Shavano Park ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Somerset ⊙</p> <p>Terrell Hills ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Universal City ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Windcrest ⊙</p>	<p>Brazoria 241,767</p> <p>Alvin ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Angleton★ ☎</p> <p>Brazoria ☎</p> <p>Churchill ☎</p> <p>Clute ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Damon ☎</p> <p>Freeport ☎</p> <p>Lake Jackson ☎</p> <p>Pearland ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Brazos 152,415</p> <p>Bryan★ ⊙ ☎</p> <p>College Station ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Brewster 8,866</p> <p>Big Bend Nat'l Park ☎</p> <p>Lajitas ☎</p> <p>Terlingua ☎</p>	<p>Caldwell 32,194</p> <p>Lockhart★ ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Luling ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Martindale ⊙</p> <p>Calhoun 20,647</p> <p>Olivia ☎</p> <p>Port Alto ☎</p> <p>Callahan 12,905</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Cameron 335,227</p> <p>Brownsville★ ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Harlingen ⊙ ☎</p> <p>Olmito ⊙</p> <p>Rancho Viejo ⊙</p> <p>San Benito ☎</p>

Camp
11,549
Pittsburg★ ⊙

Carson
6,516
Panhandle★ ⊙
White Deer ⊙

Cass
30,438
Bloomburg ☎

Castro
8,285
None reported

Chambers
26,031
None reported

Cherokee
46,659
Bullard ☎
Maydelle ☎
Troup ☎

Childress
7,688
None reported

Clay
11,006
Bluegrove ☎
Joy ☎

Cochran
3,730
None reported

Coke
3,864
None reported

Figure 26. Broadband Providers Submitting Deployment Data

- | | |
|---|---|
| ACI | La Ward Communications |
| Allegiance Telecom | Lipan Telephone |
| AT&T Broadband | Livingston Telephone Co. |
| Blossom Telephone Co. | LLNet |
| Border to Border Communications | Nortex Communications |
| Brazos Telephone Coop. | Panhandle Telecom Systems |
| Cable ONE | Partners Alliance |
| Cablevision Management Associates | Peoples Communication |
| Cameron Telephone Co. | Personal Touch Communications |
| Cap Rock Telephone Coop. | Poka Lambro Telephone Coop. |
| Charter Communications | Riviera Telephone Company |
| Classic Cable | Santa Rose Telephone Coop. |
| Coleman County Telephone Coop. | SBC/Southwestern Bell |
| Colorado Valley Internet | Shaw Communications |
| Comanche County Telephone | Southwest Arkansas Telephone Coop. |
| Community Telephone Co. | Southwest Texas Telephone Co. |
| Covad Communications | Sprint |
| Cox Communications | Sugar Land Telephone Co. |
| Delcom | Texas ALLTEL |
| DTN Speednet | Texas Cable & Telecommunications Assoc. |
| Eastex Telephone Coop. | Texas Statewide Telephone Coop., Inc. |
| Electra Telephone Co. | Texas Telephone Assoc. |
| En-Touch Systems | Time Warner Cable |
| Etex Telephone Coop. | Time Warner Telecom |
| Five Area Telephone Coop. | TXU Communications |
| Ganado Telephone Co. | Valley Telephone Coop. |
| Grande Communications | Valor Telecom |
| Grande River Communications | Verizon |
| Guadalupe Valley Communications Systems | Wehco Video |
| Guadalupe Valley Telephone Coop. | West Plains Telecommunications |
| Hill Country Telephone Coop. | WorldCom |
| Industry Telephone Coop. | XIT Rural Telephone Coop. |
| Kerrville Telephone Co. | XO Texas |
| Lake Livingston Telephone Co. | YK Communications |

List includes all submissions as of November 1, 2002.

Coleman
9,235
Lake Coleman ☎

Collin
491,675
Allen ⊙ ☎
Frisco ⊙ ☎
McKinney★ ⊙ ☎
Murphy ⊙ ☎
Parker ⊙
Plano ⊙ ☎
Richardson ⊙ ☎
Sachse ☎

Wylie ☎
Collingsworth
3,206
None reported

Colorado
20,390
Borden ☎

Comal
70,021
Bulverde ☎
Fair Oaks Ranch ⊙ ☎

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Garden Ridge	☉ 📞	Culberson	Denton
New Braunfels★	☉ 📞	2,975	432,976
Schertz	☉ 📞	None reported	Carrollton
Selma	📞		Corinth
		Dallam	Denton★
Comanche		6,222	Double Oak
14,026		Coldwater	Flower Mound
DeLeon	📞	Kerrick	Hebron
Proctor	📞	Texline	Hickory Creek
Sidney	📞		Highland Village
		Dallas	Justin
Concho		2,218,899	Krum
3,966		Addison	Lake Dallas
Eola	📞	Carrollton	Lewisville
		Cedar Hill	Marshall Creek
Cooke		Cockrell Hill	Roanoke
36,363		Coppell	Sanger
Gainesville★	📞	Dallas★	Shady Shores
Muenster	📞	DeSoto	The Colony
Myra	📞	Duncanville	Trophy Club
Valley View	📞	Farmers Branch	
		Garland	Dewitt
Coryell		Grand Prairie	20,013
74,978		Highland Park	None reported
Copperas Cove	☉ 📞	Hutchins	
Evant	📞	Irving	Dickens
Fort Hood	☉ 📞	Lancaster	2,762
		Mesquite	Afton
Cottle		Richardson	Dickens★
1,904		Rowlett	Spur
Paducah★	📞	Sachse	
		Sunnyvale	Dimmit
Crane		University Park	10,248
3,966			None reported
Crane★	📞	Dawson	
		14,985	Donley
Crockett		None reported	3,829
4,099			None reported
None reported		Deaf Smith	
		18,561	Duval
Crosby		None reported	13,120
7,072			Concepcion
White River	📞	Delta	San Diego★
		5,327	
		Ben Franklin	
		Pecan Gap	

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Eastland 18,297		High Hill	☎	Galveston 250,158	
Carbon	☎	La Grange★	⊙	Friendswood	⊙ ☎
Gorman	☎	Plum	☎	Galveston★	⊙ ☎
Olden	☎	Warrenton	☎	High Island	☎
		Fisher 4,344		Kemah	☎
Ector 121,123		None reported		La Marque	☎
Odessa★	☎			League City	☎
		Floyd 7,771		Texas City	⊙ ☎
Edwards 2,162		Quitaque	☎	Garza 4,872	
Barksdale	☎			None reported	
Rocksprings★	☎	Foard 1,622		Gillespie 20,814	
		None reported		Fredericksburg★	⊙
Ellis 111,360		Fort Bend 354,452		Harper	☎
Cedar Hill	⊙ ☎	Beasley	☎	Glasscock 1,406	
Ennis	☎	Katy	⊙ ☎	None reported	
Midlothian	☎	Meadows Place	☎	Goliad 6,928	
Waxahachie★	☎	Missouri City	⊙ ☎	None reported	
El Paso 679,622		Needville	⊙ ☎	Gonzales 18,628	
Canutillo	⊙	Richmond★	⊙	None reported	
El Paso★	⊙ ☎	Rosenburg	☎	Gray 22,744	
		Sienna Plantation	⊙	Pampa★	⊙ ☎
Erath 33,001		Stafford	⊙ ☎	Grayson 110,595	
Dublin	☎	Sugar Land	⊙ ☎	Bells	⊙
Stephenville★	☎	Franklin 9,458		Denison	⊙ ☎
		Mount Vernon★	⊙	Howe	⊙
Falls 18,576		Freestone 17,867		Sherman★	⊙ ☎
Bruceville-Eddy	⊙	None reported		Tom Bean	⊙
		Frio 16,252		Van Alstyne	⊙
Fannin 31,342		Pearsall★	☎	Whitewright	⊙
Bonham★	⊙				
Pecan Gap	☎	Gaines 14,467			
Ravenna	⊙	None reported			
Savoy	⊙				
Fayette 21,804					
Carmine	☎				

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

<p>Gregg 111,379</p> <p>Gladewater ☉ Kilgore ☉ Liberty City ☉ Longview★ ☉ ☎ White Oak ☉</p> <p>Grimes 23,552</p> <p>Navasota ☎</p> <p>Guadalupe 89,023</p> <p>Cibolo ☉ ☎ Marion ☉ Schertz ☉ ☎ Seguin★ ☉ ☎ Selma ☎</p> <p>Hale 36,602</p> <p>Plainview★ ☉ ☎</p> <p>Hall 3,782</p> <p>Turkey ☎</p> <p>Hamilton 8,229</p> <p>Evant ☎ Hamilton★ ☎ Hico ☎</p> <p>Hansford 5,369</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Hardeman 4,724</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Hardin 48,073</p> <p>Pinewood ☉ Silsbee ☎</p>	<p>Sour Lake ☉</p> <p>Harris 3,400,578</p> <p>Atascocita ☎ Baytown ☉ ☎ Bellaire ☉ ☎ Bunker Hill Village ☉ Channelview ☉ ☎ Cypress ☎ Deer Park ☎ Hedwig Village ☉ ☎ Highlands ☉ Hillshire Village ☉ ☎ Houston★ ☉ ☎ Humble ☉ ☎ Hunters Creek Village ☉ ☎ Jacinto City ☎ Jersey Village ☉ Katy ☉ ☎ Kingwood ☉ ☎ La Porte ☎ Missouri City ☉ ☎ Nassau Bay ☎ Pasadena ☉ ☎ Piney Point ☉ Seabrook ☎ South Houston ☎ Southside Place ☉ Spring ☎ Spring Valley ☉ ☎ Tomball ☉ ☎ Webster ☎ West University ☉</p> <p>Harrison 62,110</p> <p>Elysian Fields ☎ Harrison ☎ Longview ☉ ☎ Marshall★ ☉ ☎ Waskom ☎</p>	<p>Hartley 5,537</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Haskell 6,093</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Hays 97,589</p> <p>Buda ☉ Dripping Springs ☉ Hays ☉ Kyle ☉ ☎ Mountain City ☉ San Marcos★ ☉ ☎ Wimberly ☉ Woodcreek ☉</p> <p>Hemphill 3,351</p> <p>None reported</p> <p>Henderson 73,277</p> <p>Athens★ ☉ ☎ Brownsboro ☎ Chandler ☎ Gun Barrel City ☎ Lake Athens ☉ Mabank ☎ Malakoff ☎ Payne Springs ☎ Seven Points ☎ Tool ☎</p> <p>Hidalgo 569,463</p> <p>Alamo ☉ Alton ☉ Donna ☉ ☎ Edinburg★ ☉ ☎ Hargill ☎ Hidalgo ☉ La Joya ☉ Lopezville ☉</p>
--	---	---

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

McAllen	☉ 📞	Hunt		Jim Hogg	
McCook	📞	76,596		5,281	
Mercedes	☉ 📞	Campbell	📞	None reported	
Mission	☉ 📞	Greenville★	☉ 📞		
Palmhurst	☉	Lone Oak	📞	Jim Wells	
Penitas	☉			39,326	
Pharr	☉ 📞	Hutchinson		Alice★	☉ 📞
San Juan	☉	23,857		San Diego	☉
San Miguel	📞	Borger	☉ 📞		
Sullivan City	☉	Fritch	☉	Johnson	
Weslaco	☉	Stinnett★	☉	126,811	
				Burleson	☉ 📞
Hill		Irion		Cleburne★	☉ 📞
32,321		1,771		Mansfield	☉ 📞
None reported		None reported			
				Jones	
Hockley		Jack		20,785	
22,716		8,763		Abilene	☉ 📞
Levelland★	📞	Bryson	📞		
		Jermyn	📞	Karnes	
Hood				15,466	
41,100		Jackson		None reported	
Acton	☉ 📞	14,391			
Granbury★	📞	Ganado	📞	Kaufman	
Lipan	📞	La Ward	📞	71,313	
		Lolita	📞	Kaufman★	📞
Hopkins				Kemp	📞
31,960		Jasper		Mabank	📞
Brashear	📞	35,604			
Cumby	📞	Jasper★	📞	Kendall	
Miller Grove	📞			23,743	
Sulphur Springs★	📞	Jeff Davis		Boerne★	☉
		2,207		Fair Oaks Ranch	☉ 📞
Houston		None reported			
23,185				Kenedy	
None reported		Jefferson		414	
		252,051		Sarita★	📞
Howard		Beaumont★	📞		
33,627		Bevil Oaks	☉	Kent	
None reported		China	☉	859	
		Nederland	📞	Girard	📞
Hudspeth		Nome	📞	Jayton★	📞
3,344		Port Arthur	📞		
None reported				Kerr	
				43,653	
				Ingram	☉

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Kerrville★	☎	Millett	☎	Madison 12,443	
Kimble 4,468		Lavaca 19,210		None reported	
None reported		Moravia	☎	Marion 10,414	
King 356		Lee 15,657		Mims Chapel	☎
Guthrie★	☎	None reported		Martin 4,746	
Kinney 3,379		Leon 15,335		None reported	
None reported		None reported		Mason 3,738	
Kleberg 31,549		Liberty 70,154		None reported	
Kingsville★	☎	Cleveland	☎	Matagorda 39,000	
Loyola Beach	☎	Limestone 22,051		Bay City★	☎
Riviera	☎	Groesbeck★	☎	Markham	☎
Vattman	☎	Lipscomb 3,057		Maverick 44,369	
Knox 4,253		None reported		Eagle Pass★	☎
None reported		Live Oak 10,605		McColloch 8,972	
Lamar 48,499		None reported		Brady★	⊙
Paris★	⊙ ☎	Llano 17,044		Doole	☎
Roxton	⊙ ☎	None reported		Lohn	☎
Toco	⊙	Loving 97		Melvin	☎
Lamb 14,709		None reported		Mercury	☎
Earth	☎	Lubbock 242,628		Rochelle	☎
Olton	☎	Lubbock★	⊙ ☎	Voca	☎
Springlake	☎	None reported		McLennan 203,220	
Sudan	☎	Lubbock 242,628		Bellmead	⊙
Lampasas 17,762		Lubbock★	⊙ ☎	Beverly Hills	⊙
Bend	☎	Lynn 6,842		Bruceville-Eddy	⊙
La Salle 5,866		None reported		China Spring	⊙
Artesia Wells	☎			Elm Mott	⊙
Fowlerton	☎			Hewitt	⊙
				Lacy-Lakeview	⊙
				Lorena	⊙
				McGregor	⊙

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Speegleville	⊙	Porter	☎	Oldham	
Waco★	⊙ ☎	Porter Heights	☎	2,360	
Woodway	⊙	Willis	⊙	None reported	
		The Woodlands	⊙ ☎		
McMullen				Orange	
757		Moore		85,658	
Tilden★	☎	20,121		Orange★	☎
		Dumas★	⊙	Vidor	☎
Medina		Sunray	⊙		
39,304				Palo Pinto	
D'Hanis	☎	Morris		27,004	
LaCoste	⊙	13,661		Mineral Wells	⊙ ☎
		None reported		Possum Kingdom	
Menard				Lake	☎
2,311		Motley			
None reported		1,426		Panola	
		Flomont	☎	22,857	
Midland		Matador★	☎	DeBerry	☎
118,274		Roaring Springs	☎		
Midland★	⊙ ☎			Parker	
		Nacogdoches		85,000	
Milam		59,823		Lake Weatherford	⊙
25,063		Appleby	⊙	Mineral Wells	⊙ ☎
Thorndale	⊙	Nacogdoches★	⊙ ☎	Weatherford★	⊙ ☎
Mills		Navarro		Parmer	
5,151		42,436		10,466	
Big Valley	☎	Corsicana★	☎	Farwell★	☎
Mullin	☎			Lariat	☎
Priddy	☎	Newton		Lazbuddie	☎
		15,072			
Mitchell		None reported		Pecos	
9,073				16,733	
None reported		Nolan		Sheffield	☎
		15,802			
Montague		None reported		Polk	
18,276				41,133	
Forestburg	☎	Nueces		Blanchard	☎
		313,645		Goodrich	☎
Montgomery		Banquete	⊙	Livingston★	⊙ ☎
293,768		Corpus Christi★	⊙ ☎	Onalaska	⊙ ☎
Conroe★	⊙ ☎	Corpus Christi NAS	⊙	Segno	☎
Cut and Shoot	☎				
Magnolia	⊙	Ochiltree		Potter	
Montgomery	☎	9,425		110,157	
Panorama Village	⊙	Perryton★	☎	Amarillo★	⊙ ☎

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

<p>Presidio 7,304 Presidio ☎</p>	<p>Runnels 11,495 None reported</p>	<p>Scurry 18,980 None reported</p>
<p>Rains 7,509 None reported</p>	<p>Rusk 45,677 Goodsprings ☎ Kilgore ☉ Minden ☎ Mount Enterprise ☎ Oak Hill ☎ Overton ☎ Pine Hill ☎</p>	<p>Shackelford 3,395 None reported</p>
<p>Randall 104,000 Amarillo ☉ ☎</p>	<p>Sabine 11,010 None reported</p>	<p>Shelby 25,224 Huxley ☎</p>
<p>Reagan 4,192 None reported</p>	<p>San Augustine 8,275 None reported</p>	<p>Sherman 3,186 Texhoma ☎</p>
<p>Real 2,800 Camp Wood ☎</p>	<p>San Jacinto 22,000 Coldspring★ ☎ Evergreen ☎ Oakhurst ☎</p>	<p>Smith 166,164 Bullard ☎ Flint ☎ Gresham ☎ Hide-A-Way Lake ☉ Lindale ☉ Overton ☎ Troup ☎ Tyler★ ☉ ☎ Whitehouse ☉</p>
<p>Red River 14,314 Clarksville★ ☉</p>	<p>San Patricio 67,138 Mathis ☉</p>	<p>Somervell 6,098 None reported</p>
<p>Reeves 15,182 None reported</p>	<p>San Saba 6,186 Bend ☎ Cherokee ☎ Locker ☎ Richland Springs ☎ San Saba★ ☎</p>	<p>Starr 53,597 El Sauz ☎ Garciasville ☉ La Grulla ☉ Rio Grande City★ ☉ Roma ☉ San Isidro ☎</p>
<p>Refugio 7,828 None reported</p>	<p>Schleicher 2,990 None reported</p>	<p>Stephens 10,063 None reported</p>
<p>Roberts 873 Miami★ ☎</p>		
<p>Robertson 15,456 Bremond ☎</p>		
<p>Rockwall 35,413 Rockwall★ ☎ Rowlett ☉ ☎</p>		

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

<p>Sterling 1,402 None reported</p>	<p>Southlake ☉ ☎ Watauga ☉ ☎ Westover Hills ☉ White Settlement ☉ ☎</p>	<p>Westlake Hills ☉ ☎</p>
<p>Stonewall 1,693 Peacock ☎</p>	<p>Taylor 128,041 Abilene★ ☉ ☎</p>	<p>Trinity 12,709 None reported</p>
<p>Sutton 4,556 None reported</p>	<p>Terrell 1,081 Sanderson★ ☎</p>	<p>Tyler 19,600 Chester ☎</p>
<p>Swisher 8,930 None reported</p>	<p>Terry 12,761 None reported</p>	<p>Upshur 34,929 Bettie ☎ Gilmer★ ☎ Gladewater ☉ Graceton ☎ Mings Chapel ☎ Ore City ☎ Pritchett ☎ Rhonesboro ☎ Rosewood ☎ Sand Hill ☎ Simpsonville ☎ Union Grove ☉ Valley View ☎ West Mountain ☎</p>
<p>Tarrant 1,466,219 Arlington ☉ ☎ Bedford ☉ ☎ Benbrook ☉ ☎ Blue Mound ☉ Burleson ☉ ☎ Colleyville ☉ Crowley ☉ Dalworthington Gardens ☉ Edgecliff ☉ Eules ☉ ☎ Everman ☉ Forest Hill ☉ ☎ Fort Worth★ ☉ ☎ Grand Prairie ☉ ☎ Grapevine ☉ ☎ Haltom City ☉ ☎ Haslet ☉ Hurst ☉ ☎ Keller ☉ ☎ Kennedale ☉ ☎ Lake Worth ☉ ☎ Mansfield ☉ ☎ North Richland Hills ☉ ☎ Pantego ☉ ☎ Richland Hills ☉ ☎ River Oaks ☉ Saginaw ☉ ☎</p>	<p>Throckmorton 1,850 Woodson ☎</p> <p>Titus 26,533 Mount Pleasant★ ☉ ☎ Talco ☎ Winfield ☉</p> <p>Tom Green 104,010 San Angelo★ ☉ ☎</p> <p>Travis 812,280 Austin★ ☉ ☎ Bee Cave ☉ ☎ Briarcliff ☉ Jonestown ☉ Lago Vista ☉ Lakeway ☉ ☎ Manor ☎ Pflugerville ☉ ☎ Point Venture ☉ Rollingwood ☉ ☎ San Leanna ☉ Sunset Valley ☉ Village of the Hills ☉</p>	<p>Upton 4,129 None reported</p> <p>Uvalde 25,200 Knippa ☎ Utopia ☎ Uvalde★ ☎</p> <p>Val Verde 43,484 Comstock ☎ Langtry ☎</p> <p>Van Zandt 42,782 Grand Saline ☉ Wynne ☎</p>

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

<p>Victoria 81,695</p> <p>Victoria★ ☉ 📞</p>	<p>Willacy 17,705</p> <p>Lasara 📞 Port Mansfield 📞 San Perlita 📞</p>	<p>Young 17,764</p> <p>Loving 📞 Newcastle 📞 Olney 📞</p>
<p>Walker 61,678</p> <p>Huntsville★ ☉ 📞</p>	<p>Williamson 203,428</p> <p>Cedar Park ☉ 📞 Florence 📞 Georgetown★ ☉ 📞 Hutto ☉ Leander ☉ 📞 Round Rock ☉ 📞 Taylor ☉ Thrall ☉ Thorndale ☉</p>	<p>Zapata 10,803</p> <p>None reported</p>
<p>Waller 32,663</p> <p>Brookshire 📞 Katy ☉ 📞</p>	<p>Wilson 32,408</p> <p>La Vernia 📞 Stockdale ☉</p>	<p>Zavala 11,953</p> <p>None reported</p>
<p>Ward 12,912</p> <p>None reported</p>	<p>Winkler 8,308</p> <p>Kermit★ ☉</p>	<p>Wise 40,894</p> <p>Boyd 📞 Bridgeport 📞 Chico 📞 Decatur★ 📞 Rhone 📞</p>
<p>Washington 29,559</p> <p>Brenham★ 📞</p>	<p>Wood 36,752</p> <p>Golden 📞 Mineola ☉ Quitman★ ☉ Yantis 📞</p>	<p>Yoakum 7,322</p> <p>Pleasant Hill 📞</p>
<p>Webb 180,011</p> <p>Laredo★ ☉ 📞 Mirando City 📞</p>	<p>Wharton 41,522</p> <p>El Campo 📞 Louise 📞 Wharton★ 📞</p>	<p>Wheeler 5,588</p> <p>None reported</p>
<p>Wichita 133,008</p> <p>Wichita Falls★ 📞</p>	<p>Wilbarger 14,676</p> <p>Oklaunion 📞</p>	<p>Wichita 133,008</p> <p>Wichita Falls★ 📞</p>

APPENDIX C: TELECOMMUNICATIONS TIMELINE

The federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“the Act”) ushered in an unprecedented wave of mergers and acquisitions, and more recent economic woes have brought significant bankruptcies and reorganizations. This timeline follows some of the more significant events, mergers, and other transactions in the telecommunications industry since the Act took effect.

Table 3. Timeline of Telecommunications Events Since Passage of the Act

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
2002	November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FCC approves AT&T Broadband-Comcast merger
	October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SBC is allowed to raise local telephone rates for 30 percent of its Texas lines ■ Williams Communications emerges from bankruptcy, rechristens itself WiTel Communications Group ■ FCC declines to approve Hughes-EchoStar merger ■ SBC fined \$6 million by FCC for blocking rival’s access to Ameritech network ■ UUNet suffers major service outage, disrupts global Internet traffic
	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SBC announces 11,000 more job cuts ■ Sprint agrees to sell its directory operations to R. H. Donnelley for \$2.2 billion ■ Qwest announces it overstated revenue by \$1.5 billion ■ FCC clears BellSouth to offer long distance in 5 states, SBC applies to offer long distance in California ■ WorldCom hints additional \$2 billion in accounting fraud ■ SBC announces deal with Yahoo! to offer DSL, offers tiered pricing ■ WorldCom CEO John Sidgmore announces resignation ■ Teligent emerges from bankruptcy
	August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AOL Time Warner agrees to buy AT&T’s 28 percent stake in Time Warner Entertainment for \$9 billion, including a 21 percent stake in Time Warner Cable ■ Qwest sells Dex phone directory unit for \$7 billion ■ Cingular and VoiceStream ponder merger ■ Verizon Wireless acquires Price Communications (Cellular One) ■ WorldCom reveals additional \$3 billion in accounting fraud ■ Global Crossing accepts \$250 million buyout from Hutchison Whampoa and Singapore Technologies Telemia ■ Sprint PCS launches first nationwide 3G wireless network, dubbed Sprint Vision ■ Verizon announces plans to bundle local phone, wireless, and DSL on one bill
	July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Qwest reveals it has incorrectly accounted for \$1.1 billion in expenses ■ Birch Telecom files for bankruptcy ■ AT&T posts \$13 billion quarterly loss; BellSouth net income down 67 percent; Verizon posts \$2 billion loss ■ WorldCom files for bankruptcy, becomes largest U.S. bankruptcy case ■ FCC delays implementation of wireless number portability until November 2003 ■ AT&T Wireless and VoiceStream ponder merger ■ MCI WorldCom raises fees for its Texas long-distance customers ■ Pacific Bell (SBC) agrees to \$27 million fine for DSL billing problems
	June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ WorldCom reveals it has hidden nearly \$4 billion in debt from investors, regulators; share prices fall below \$1 ■ Adelphia files for bankruptcy ■ SBC names former Sen. John Montford as president of its Southwestern Bell and SNET subsidiaries

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
2002 (con'd)	June (con'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PUC fines MCI WorldCom \$245,000 for slamming violations ■ XO Communications files for bankruptcy ■ Qwest CEO Joseph Nacchio resigns, is replaced by former Ameritech chairman Richart Notebaert ■ Number of Texans signing up for Texas No-Call List exceeds 500,000 ■ SBC and Hughes announce plans to market high-speed Internet service via satellite in 146 Texas counties not served by DSL ■ Texas Supreme Court ruling clears way for SBC to raise phone rates in 32 cities ■ Verizon president Lawrence Babbio says DSL, telephone prices are too low ■ Metrocall files for bankruptcy
	May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Federal appeals court throws out FCC's line-sharing, network unbundling rules ■ FCC fines SBC \$3.6 million for false information on long distance bids, including Texas ■ FCC approves BellSouth's bids to offer long-distance in Georgia and Louisiana ■ Metromedia Fiber Networks files for bankruptcy ■ SBC announces another 5,000 job cuts; more than 120,000 job cuts announced industry-wide since January 2002
	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ WorldCom CEO Bernie Ebbers resigns, is succeeded by John Sidgmore ■ SBC fined \$2 million for missing access goals in Ameritech merger; fines exceed \$62 million since December 2000 ■ Williams Communications files for bankruptcy ■ AOL Time Warner posts quarterly loss of \$54.2 billion ■ AT&T posts quarterly loss exceeding \$1 billion ■ SBC posts first quarterly loss in 5 years, cuts additional 8,000 jobs; Verizon also posts quarterly loss ■ SBC and EchoStar announce marketing partnership, offer bundled DSL service and satellite multi-channel programming ■ MCI WorldCom launches flat-rate local telecommunications services in 32 states ■ AT&T Wireless and Cingular enter merger talks
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Alltel acquires CenturyTel's wireless division ■ FCC determines that cable modem service is an "information service" ■ SEC opens inquiries into accounting practices of Qwest and WorldCom ■ For first time, monthly sales of new cell phones declines ■ Broadband usage accounts for half of all time spent online
	February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House passes Tauzin-Dingell Bill (H. R. 1542) ■ Globalstar, International FiberCom, Logix, and OmniPlex file for bankruptcy ■ FCC approves limited, unlicensed use of ultrawideband technologies
	January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Global Crossing files for bankruptcy ■ Verizon Wireless debuts Express Network, the nation's first high-speed wireless network ■ McLeod USA files for bankruptcy ■ Valor begins offering high-speed Internet access via satellite ■ Qualcomm offers first 3G wireless handsets and PDAs
2001	December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Enron Broadband Services files for bankruptcy ■ AT&T agrees to sell broadband division to Comcast and Microsoft for \$47 billion ■ Covad Communications emerges from bankruptcy ■ Enron declares bankruptcy
	November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CoServ files for bankruptcy ■ Sprint inks deal to market long-distance service to AOL's 33 million members ■ FCC approves SBC's long-distance applications for Arkansas and Missouri ■ SBC partners with Yahoo! to provide Internet content, scraps Prodigy ■ SBC, Covad agree on financing deal to help Covad emerge from bankruptcy ■ Verizon Wireless holds initial public offering ■ FCC boosts spectrum available to large wireless providers; bankrupt NextWave gives up on its licenses

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
2001 (con'd)	October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hughes DirecTV announces plans to merge with EchoStar (Dish Network) ■ AT&T cancels Project Angel; Sprint ends fixed wireless service in Houston; SBC slows investment in Project Pronto; Qwest stops construction of world-wide network ■ SBC acquires remaining share of Prodigy ■ AT&T and British Telecom terminate Concert joint venture ■ AT&T Wireless acquires remaining 77 percent of TeleCorp PCS ■ Excite@Home files for bankruptcy, agrees to sell assets to AT&T Broadband
	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T enters merger talks with BellSouth ■ WorldCom offers to acquire assets of Rhythms NetConnections ■ SBC offers to acquire remaining 58 percent share of Prodigy ■ Verizon reports first-ever net decrease in access lines it serves ■ AT&T raises fees for Texas long-distance consumers
	August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SBC resubmits long-distance application for Missouri, seeks authorization for Arkansas ■ Birch Telecom begins offering residential service in Texas ■ OpTel ceases providing telecommunications services in Houston ■ Alltel makes unsolicited \$6 billion offer for CenturyTel, seeks to become nation's largest telecommunications company focused on rural areas ■ MediaOne splits from AT&T ■ PUC fines AT&T \$3.7 million for slamming violations ■ Covad Communications files for bankruptcy ■ Rhythms NetConnections files for bankruptcy
	July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Qwest, Sprint, and WorldCom all report heavily diminished profits; Global Crossing posts wider-than-expected loss ■ SBC raises pay phone rates to 50¢ per call from 35¢ ■ Comcast makes unsolicited \$58 billion offer for AT&T Broadband ■ AT&T Wireless spun off from AT&T
	June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Global Crossing completes its 100,000-mile, \$20 billion world-wide network ■ PSINet and 360Networks USA file for bankruptcy ■ Sprint reconsiders launch of ION high-speed integrated network ■ SBC withdraws application to provide long-distance service in Missouri
	May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Alcatel attempts to buy Lucent, but talks between them fail ■ WideOpenWest acquires four cable systems from SBC ■ AT&T considers combining some business units with those of British Telecommunications, files breakup plan with SEC ■ Teligent files for bankruptcy
	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Qwest allies with Microsoft to provide MSN Internet access and content over its fiber-optic network ■ FCC approves Deutsche Telekom's acquisition of VoiceStream ■ FCC authorizes Verizon to provide long-distance service in Massachusetts ■ SBC seeks long-distance authorization for Missouri ■ FCC fines SBC \$4.6 million for performance woes in Ameritech territory
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ DSL provider Winfire ceases operations, stranding Texas customers ■ AT&T buys NorthPoint Communications; many NorthPoint customers left without DSL service ■ Sprint mulls possible merger with BellSouth ■ ConnectSouth Communications files for bankruptcy ■ Deal falls through between Enron and Blockbuster for videos streamed over broadband direct to consumers' premises ■ SBC scales back plans to compete for local telephone customers in markets outside its traditional service territories, faces fines ■ Federal appeals court overturns FCC rules preventing cable companies from serving more than 30 percent market-share

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
2001 (con'd)	February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T announces plans to sell some cable systems to Mediacom, Charter ■ NorthPoint Communications files for bankruptcy, sues Verizon
	January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ President Bush nominates Michael Powell to chair FCC ■ FCC authorizes SBC to provide long-distance service in Kansas, Oklahoma ■ FCC approves WorldCom's takeover of Digex (Intermedia) ■ Allegiance Telecom buys Jump.Net ■ FCC approves AOL-Time Warner merger on condition that instant messaging be open to rivals ■ SBC issues line of credit to Prodigy
2000	December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FTC approves AOL-Time Warner merger on condition that cable systems be open to at least three competing ISPs
	November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Verizon scuttles merger with NorthPoint ■ Time Warner agrees to allow Earthlink access to its cable systems ■ Verizon Wireless buys Price Communications (Cellular One) ■ WorldCom decides to issue tracking stock for long-distance unit
	October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T board of directors supports plan to split into four companies ■ Verizon Wireless postpones initial public offering ■ Warner Music Group terminates merger with EMI Group, helping win European Union approval for AOL-Time Warner merger
	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FCC approves merger of SBC and BellSouth wireless units; new company to be called Cingular Wireless ■ News Corp acquires 21.5 percent of Gemstar from Liberty Media (AT&T) in exchange for 5 percent of Sky Global Networks ■ SBC agrees to acquire 6 percent of Covad Communications ■ WorldCom agrees to buy Intermedia and its controlling stake in Digex
	August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ DOJ approves SBC-BellSouth wireless merger ■ AT&T increases its voting share of Excite@Home to 74 percent ■ Verizon agrees to merge its DSL operations with NorthPoint Communications ■ News Corp buys Chris-Craft, now owns 13 TV stations in nation's top 10 television markets ■ VoiceStream Wireless offers to buy PowerTel ■ Viacom agrees to buy portion of Infinity it does not already own ■ FCC approves Clear Channel's acquisition of AMFM; Clear Channel becomes nation's largest radio station operator
	July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Deutsche Telekom offers to buy VoiceStream Wireless ■ Sprint and WorldCom terminate proposed merger ■ Time Warner agrees to give Juno access to its cable systems ■ Enron and Blockbuster (Viacom) agree to stream movies over DSL ■ AT&T and Charter Communications call off plans to swap cable systems
	June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FCC approves SBC's long-distance application for Texas ■ FCC approves Bell Atlantic-GTE merger; new company named Verizon; Genuity (GTE Internetworking) spun off as separate company ■ FCC approves AT&T-MediaOne merger ■ Vivendi announces merger with Seagram and Canal+; new company to be called Vivendi Universal ■ AOL tops 23 million subscribers, acquires MapQuest, launches AOLTV, announces AOL Mobile Service with Sprint PCS ■ AT&T Wireless acquires PrimeCo's Houston, GTE's San Diego, and Vodafone's San Francisco networks ■ News Corp consolidates satellite holdings into Sky Global Networks
	May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ VoiceStream completes merger with Aerial Corporation ■ NTT Communications agrees to buy Verio

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
2000 (con'd)	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FCC approves merger between Bell Atlantic Wireless and Vodafone AirTouch; new company dubbed Verizon Wireless ■ SBC and BellSouth agree to merge wireless operations ■ European Union approves Vodafone-Mannesmann deal
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FCC approves Qwest-US West merger; combined company called Qwest ■ AT&T creates wireless tracking stock, purchases 39 percent of Net2Phone ■ Vodafone announces plans to acquire Mannesmann ■ Tribune Co. announces plans to acquire Times Mirror
	February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ VoiceStream completes merger with Omnipoint ■ Alltel, Bell Atlantic, and GTE agree to swap wireless systems as part of merger approval
	January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ America Online and Time Warner announce merger plans ■ Warner Music Group and EMI Group announce merger plans ■ Cox purchases Multimedia Cablevision from Gannett
1999	December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PUC endorses SBC's long-distance application for Texas ■ FCC approves Bell Atlantic's long-distance application for New York, making it the first Baby Bell authorized to provide long-distance services
	November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cincinnati Bell completes merger with IXC Communications; combined company rechristened Broadwing ■ SBC acquires 43 percent of Prodigy
	October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sprint and WorldCom announce merger plans ■ WorldCom acquires SkyTel ■ SBC launches Project Pronto, completes merger with Ameritech ■ Clear Channel announces plans to acquire AMFM
	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CBS agrees to merge with Viacom ■ Bell Atlantic, AirTouch, and PrimeCo agree to combine wireless operations into new company; GTE wireless properties would be added following approval of its merger with Bell Atlantic ■ Valor agrees to purchase 400,000 access lines in Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma from GTE
	July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T agrees to swap several cable systems with Cox Communications ■ Cincinnati Bell agrees to merge with IXC Communications ■ US West terminates proposed merger with Global Crossing, agrees to merge with Qwest ■ SBC enters strategic marketing alliance with DirecTV (Hughes)
	June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ U.K.-based Vodafone merges with U.S.-based AirTouch ■ SBC Wireless and Western Wireless become management partners for the CellularOne network
	May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ America Online acquires MovieFone, Nullsoft, and Spinner Networks ■ MediaOne agrees to merge with AT&T, cancels merger agreement with Comcast ■ AT&T acquires Vanguard Cellular Systems, agrees to swap several cable systems with Comcast ■ US West agrees to merge with Global Crossing ■ VoiceStream Wireless is spun off from Western Wireless
	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T acquires U.S. assets of IBM Global Network ■ News Corp acquires Liberty Media's interests in Fox Sports Net
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T completes its acquisition of TCI (including Liberty Media) ■ MediaOne agrees to merge with Comcast
	February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ AT&T and Time Warner announce strategic relationship to offer local telephony via cable

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Year	Month	Event, Merger, or Transaction
1998	December	■ Seagram acquires PolyGram, forming world's largest music recording company
	November	■ America Online acquires Netscape
	October	■ SBC completes merger with Southern New England Telecommunications
	September	■ WorldCom acquires MCI
	July	■ AT&T completes merger with Teleport Communications Group ■ Bell Atlantic and GTE announce merger plans
	June	■ Time Warner, MediaOne, Advance/Newhouse, Compaq, and Microsoft form joint venture for cable broadband; combined effort dubbed Road Runner ■ (Old) US West splits into two companies, MediaOne and (New) US West ■ CBS acquires King World
	May	■ SBC announces plans to merge with Ameritech
	April	■ Bell Atlantic files application seeking long-distance authorization for New York ■ AirTouch acquires MediaOne's (US West's) wireless operations and its 25 percent stake in PrimeCo
	February	■ Time Warner sells Six Flags amusements parks to Premier Parks
	January	■ MCI acquires CompuServe from America Online in exchange for network support contracts; AOL retains CompuServe's online services ■ SBC announces plans to merge with Southern New England Telecommunications
1997	December	■ GTE Internetworking (formed by GTE's acquisition of BBN) acquires Genuity ■ Covad Communications launches competitive DSL service in San Francisco
	November	■ PrimeCo launches nationwide wireless network ■ SBC introduces DSL service in Austin, San Francisco
	September	■ America Online and MCI jointly acquire CompuServe from Bertelsmann
	August	■ Bell Atlantic completes merger with NYNEX
	June	■ News Corp., Fox/Liberty (then part of TCI), and Rainbow Media create alliance of regional sports cable networks dubbed Fox Sports Net
	April	■ SBC completes merger with Pacific Bell (Pacific Telesis Group)
	February	■ News Corp and EchoStar launch direct broadcast satellite service
1996	December	■ AT&T divests National Cash Register ■ MCI merges with MFS, thus acquiring UUNET
	November	■ AirTouch, Bell Atlantic, NYNEX, and US West launch domestic wireless service in 16 markets through a joint venture dubbed PrimeCo
	October	■ Time Warner acquires Turner Broadcasting System
	September	■ AT&T divests Lucent Technologies
	August	■ MFS acquires UUNET
	April	■ Bell Atlantic agrees to merge with NYNEX ■ SBC agrees to merge with Pacific Telesis Group
	February	■ Walt Disney acquires ABC ■ Telecommunications Act of 1996 takes effect

APPENDIX D: FINANCIAL INDICATORS OF MAJOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES

The telecommunications industry has lost approximately \$2 trillion in market capitalization over the past two years because of a slumping economy, credit rating downgrades, investor jitters, and slow to negative revenue growth. The industry has also shed a half million jobs during that time, and dozens of companies have filed for bankruptcy. Appendix E, which begins on page 167, provides a list of notable telecommunications bankruptcies filed since 2001.

The following table shows the opening stock price on August 1, 2002, the 5-year high and low prices, the percentage off the 5-year high price, the bond rating and outlook of Standard & Poor's, and the number of outstanding shares for 22 selected national telecommunications and/or cable companies.

Table 4. Financial Indicators of Major Telecommunications Companies

Company Name	Symbol	Opening Price on 8/1/02	5-Year High	5-Year Low	% Off 5-Year High	S&P Rating	S&P Outlook	Shares Outstanding (000)
Allegiance	ALGX	\$1.20	\$110.14	\$0.85	99%	CCC	Watch Neg.	116,430
ALLTEL	AT	\$40.55	\$91.81	\$30.94	56%	A	Negative	310,940
AOL Time Warner	AOL	\$11.15	\$95.81	\$3.89	88%	BBB+	Stable	4,452,708
AT&T	T	\$10.12	\$64.12	\$8.54	84%	BBB+	Watch Neg.	3,598,611
AT&T Wireless	AWE	\$4.66	\$35.06	\$4.22	87%	BBB	Stable	2,706,626
BellSouth	BLS	\$26.60	\$53.50	\$20.10	50%	A+	Stable	1,874,455
Broadwing	BRW	\$2.03	\$41.06	\$1.90	95%	BB	Stable	218,827
Cablevision	CVC	\$8.00	\$91.88	\$5.25	91%	BB+	Negative	175,480
CenturyTel	CTL	\$26.10	\$49.02	\$15.74	47%	BBB+	Stable	141,350
Charter	CHTR	\$3.52	\$27.75	\$2.37	87%	BB	Negative	294,697
Comcast	CMCS	\$21.05	\$57.69	\$11.00	64%	BBB	Watch Neg.	914,500
Cox	COX	\$27.00	\$58.38	\$12.50	54%	BBB	Stable	600,746
EchoStar	DISH	\$16.11	\$81.25	\$1.64	80%	B+	Watch Pos.	480,080
Genuity	GENU	\$0.34	\$225.00	\$0.23	99.9%	CCC-	Watch Neg.	11,180
Hughes	GMH	\$9.90	\$45.46	\$8.49	78%	BB-	Watch Neg.	1,438,720
Qwest	Q	\$1.42	\$65.06	\$1.20	98%	B+	Watch Dev.	1,676,906
SBC	SBC	\$27.45	\$59.94	\$22.20	54%	AA-	Stable	3,340,171
Sprint	FON	\$9.50	\$75.94	\$6.65	87%	BBB-	Stable	891,083

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Company Name	Symbol	Opening Price on 8/1/02	5-Year High	5-Year Low	% Off 5-Year High	S&P Rating	S&P Outlook	Shares Outstanding (000)
Sprint PCS	PCS	\$3.80	\$66.94	\$2.36	94%	BBB-	Stable	992,514
Time Warner Telecom	TWTC	\$1.27	\$93.00	\$0.47	99%	B+	Negative	114,760
Verizon	VZ	\$33.15	\$69.50	\$26.58	52%	A+	Negative	2,723,018
WorldCom	WCOM	\$0.14	\$64.54	\$0.12	99.8%	D	N/A	2,962,836

Sources: CNN Money, Hoover's Online, Standard & Poor's, and various news accounts.

Of the \$2 trillion in lost market capitalization since 2000, about \$1.5 trillion is represented by the 22 companies listed above. However, there are signs that the telecommunications sector is beginning to make a comeback. Though job losses and bankruptcy filings continue, they are coming at a significantly slower pace. In addition, the stocks of 19 of these 22 companies have risen since August 1, but all are still well below their 5-year highs.

APPENDIX E: NOTABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BANKRUPTCY FILINGS

Dozens of telecommunications service providers and related companies have filed for bankruptcy since the beginning of 2001. Several of these companies, such as Covad Communications, have already emerged from bankruptcy protection, and some on the list below may also be out of bankruptcy.

Table 5. Selected Telecommunications Companies Filing for Bankruptcy Since 2001

Company	Date Filed	Bankruptcy Court	Areas in Texas Served by Company
360Networks USA	6/29/01	So. Dist. New York	Amarillo, Austin, Dallas, Houston, Lubbock, San Antonio
Actel Integrated Communications	4/11/01	E. Dist. Louisiana	None
Adelphia Business Solutions	3/27/02	So. Dist. New York	Austin, Dallas, Houston
Adelphia Communications	6/25/02	So. Dist. New York	None
Advanced Radio Telecom	4/20/01	Delaware	Several dozen licenses for spectrum, including D/FW area and Houston
Advanced TelCom Group	5/2/02	No. Dist. California	None
Ardent Communications	10/10/01	District of Columbia	Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio
AtLink Networks	4/25/01	Colorado	None
AxisTel Communications	7/30/01	Delaware	Austin, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, San Antonio
Birch Telecom	7/29/02	Delaware	Abilene, Amarillo, Beaumont, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Galveston, Houston, Longview, Lubbock, Marshall, Midland, Odessa, Orange, Port Arthur, San Antonio, Temple, Tyler, Waco, Wichita Falls
BroadLink Wireless	6/25/02	Unspecified	None
Clariti Telecommunications Int'l	4/18/02	Unspecified	None
Classic Communications	11/13/01	Delaware	Statewide
ConnectSouth Communications	3/24/01	N/A	Texas-based company
Convergent Communications	4/19/01	District of Columbia	Dallas
CoServ	11/30/01	No. Dist. Texas	North Texas
Covad Communications	8/15/01	Delaware	Austin
e.spire Communications	3/22/01	Delaware	Amarillo, Austin, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Irving, San Antonio
eGlobe	4/18/01	Unspecified	Unspecified

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Company	Date Filed	Bankruptcy Court	Areas in Texas Served by Company
Excite@Home	9/28/01	No. Dist. California	Dallas, Houston
FutureOne	3/29/01	Colorado	Unspecified
Global Crossing	1/28/02	So. Dist. New York	Houston
Globalstar	2/15/02	Delaware	Statewide
International FiberCom	2/13/02	Arizona	Unspecified
ITC DeltaCom	6/25/02	Delaware	Austin, Beaumont, Bryan, Dallas, Houston, Longview, San Antonio, Waco
Logix	2/28/02	So. Dist. Texas	Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio
McLeod USA	1/31/02	Delaware	Austin, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston, McAllen, San Antonio, Tyler, Victoria, Waco
Metricom (Ricochet Wireless)	7/2/01	No. Dist. California	Dallas, Houston
Metrocall	6/3/02	Delaware	Statewide
Metromedia Fiber Networks	5/20/02	So. Dist. New York	D/FW Metroplex, Houston
Neon Communications	6/26/02	Delaware	None
Net2000 Communications	11/16/01	Delaware	Dallas
NetVoice Technologies	10/17/01	E. Dist. Louisiana	Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso
Network Plus	2/5/02	So. Dist. New York	None
NorthPoint Communications	1/16/01	N. Dist. California	None
Omniplex Communications Group	2/28/01	E. Dist. Missouri	Dallas, Houston
Pathnet Telecommunications	4/2/01	Delaware	Amarillo, Beaumont, Houston
Pensat	10/9/01	District of Columbia	None
PSINet	6/1/01	So. Dist. New York	Abilene, Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, Lubbock, San Angelo, San Antonio
qServe Communications	6/21/02	Unspecified	None
REAnet	4/2/01	Colorado	None
Rhythms NetConnections	8/2/01	So. Dist. New York	Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio
Star Telecommunications	3/13/01	Unspecified	Unspecified
StarBand Communications	5/31/02	Unspecified	Statewide
Teleglobe Communications	5/29/02	Delaware	Dallas, Houston
Telergy	10/26/01	No. Dist. New York	None
Teligent	5/21/01	So. Dist. New York	Austin, Dallas, Houston, San Antonio
Tess Communications	3/23/01	Colorado	None
U.S. Wireless	8/29/01	Delaware	None

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

Company	Date Filed	Bankruptcy Court	Areas in Texas Served by Company
Vectris	1/18/01	W. Dist. Texas	Unspecified
Viatel	5/2/01	Delaware	Dallas, Houston
Vitts Networks	2/7/01	Delaware	None
Wavve Telecommunications	8/15/01	E. Dist. California	None
Williams Communications Group	4/22/02	So. Dist. New York	Subsidiaries currently unaffected
WINfirst	3/13/02	Colorado	None
WinStar Communications	4/18/01	Delaware	Dallas
WorldCom	7/21/02	So. Dist. New York	Statewide
XO Communications	6/17/02	So. Dist. New York	Subsidiaries currently unaffected
Yipes Communications	3/22/02	No. Dist. California	None

Sources: Law Offices of Jim Boyle, Miller & Van Eaton, New Generation Research, and various news articles, publications, and corporate press releases.

**APPENDIX F:
STATUS OF LONG-DISTANCE ENTRY APPLICATIONS**

As of November 1, 2002, regional Bell operating companies have been approved to sell in-region interLATA service in 23 states, pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) had 13 applications pending as of that date. Southwestern Bell has been approved to offer interLATA service in all five of its states.

Table 6. Status of Long-Distance Entry Applications by State

State	Filed By	Status	Date Filed	Date Resolved
Alabama	BellSouth	Approved	6/20/02	9/18/02
Arkansas	SBC	Approved	8/20/01	11/16/01
California	SBC	Pending	9/20/02	
Colorado	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	6/13/02	9/10/02
Connecticut	Verizon	Approved	4/23/01	7/20/01
Delaware	Verizon	Approved	6/27/02	9/25/02
Florida	BellSouth	Pending	9/20/02	
Georgia	BellSouth	Approved	2/14/02	5/15/02
		Withdrawn	10/2/01	12/20/01
Idaho	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	6/13/02	9/10/02
Iowa	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	6/13/02	9/10/02
Kansas	SBC	Approved	10/26/00	1/22/01
Kentucky	BellSouth	Approved	6/20/02	9/18/02
Louisiana	BellSouth	Approved	2/14/02	5/15/02
		Withdrawn	10/2/01	12/20/01
		Denied	7/9/98	10/13/98
		Denied	11/6/97	2/4/98

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

State	Filed By	Status	Date Filed	Date Resolved
Maine	Verizon	Approved	3/21/02	6/19/02
Massachusetts	Verizon	Approved	1/16/01	4/16/01
		Withdrawn	9/22/00	12/18/00
Michigan	Ameritech (SBC)	Denied	5/21/97	8/19/97
		Withdrawn	1/2/97	2/11/97
Mississippi	BellSouth	Approved	6/20/02	9/18/02
Missouri	SBC	Approved	8/20/01	11/16/01
		Withdrawn	4/4/01	6/7/01
Montana	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	7/12/02	9/10/02
Nebraska	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	6/13/02	9/10/02
New Hampshire	Verizon	Approved	6/27/02	9/25/02
New Jersey	Verizon	Approved	3/26/02	6/24/02
		Withdrawn	12/20/01	3/19/02
New York	Verizon	Approved	9/29/99	12/22/99
North Carolina	BellSouth	Approved	6/20/02	9/18/02
North Dakota	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	6/13/02	9/10/02
Oklahoma	SBC	Approved	10/26/00	1/22/01
		Denied	4/1/97	6/26/97
Pennsylvania	Verizon	Approved	6/21/01	9/19/01
Rhode Island	Verizon	Approved	11/26/01	2/24/02
South Carolina	BellSouth	Approved	6/20/02	9/18/02
		Denied	9/30/97	12/24/97
Tennessee	BellSouth	Pending	9/20/02	
Texas	SBC	Approved	4/5/00	6/30/00
		Withdrawn	1/10/00	4/5/00

C O M M I T T E E O N S T A T E A F F A I R S

State	Filed By	Status	Date Filed	Date Resolved
Utah	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	7/12/02	9/10/02
Vermont	Verizon	Approved	1/17/02	4/27/02
Virginia	Verizon	Approved	8/1/02	10/30/02
Washington	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	7/12/02	9/10/02
Wyoming	Qwest	Pending	9/30/02	
		Withdrawn	7/12/02	9/10/02

Source: Federal Communications Commission and various news articles and press releases.

APPENDIX G: SUMMARY OF TIF GRANTS

Since its inception, TIF has awarded nearly \$1 billion in grants in 47 grant offerings, or requests for proposals (RFPs), to thousands of public school campuses and districts, public libraries, academic and school libraries, institutions of higher education, and public and not-for-profit healthcare facilities, the exact number of which is not known. There are six types of grants: Public Schools (PS), Higher Education (HE), Library (LB), Health Care (PH or HC), Discovery (DI), and Community Networking (CN). In addition, the TIF Board has provided 13 special project grants, which it has awarded to individual entities for specific purposes. The Legislature has also appropriated \$126 million to other agencies from the TIF account. All of these grant offerings, awards, and appropriations are summarized below.

Public School

Competitive Grant for Texas Public Schools with 70 Percent or Greater Economically Disadvantaged Students (PS1)

- Issued: July 16, 1996
- Awarded: November 15, 1996
- Grant Period: February 1, 1997-January 31, 1998
- Recipients: 85 districts representing 124 campuses
- \$23.8 million awarded, of which \$23.5 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Texas secondary public schools with a student population comprised of 70 percent or greater economically disadvantaged students with limited or no access to the Internet or technology.

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, channel service units (CSU/DSU), and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30-60 workstations per entity depending on district size. This grant initiative was awarded at the district level and was only available to campuses that had a student population that was 70 percent or greater economically disadvantaged

Competitive Grants for Rural Public Schools (PS2)

- Issued: February 7, 1997
- Awarded: July 11, 1997
- Grant Period: September 1, 1997-August 31, 1998
- Recipients: 13 collaborative projects

- \$28.5 million awarded, all to rural school districts, of which \$28.2 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Rural or remote public school districts or collaboratives of public school districts that have dial-up access or non-integrated direct access. Rural school districts are defined as districts with an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of fewer than 1,000 students.

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30-45 workstations per entity depending on district size. This grant initiative was only available to rural school districts.

Non-Competitive Internet Connectivity Grants for Public Schools (PS3)

- Issued: September 10, 1997
- Awarded: January 9, 1998
- Grant Period: February 1, 1998-April 30, 1999
- Recipients: 742 campuses
- \$58.2 million awarded, of which \$57.1 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public schools were divided into three categories based on ADA: 5,000 or fewer students, 5,000-10,000 students, 10,000 or more students. 5,000 or fewer student applied on behalf of the district (districts receiving prior TIF funding or having direct access to the Internet were not eligible); 5,000-10,000 applied on behalf of five high school, junior high, or middle school campuses (campuses receiving prior TIF funding or having direct access to the Internet were not eligible); and greater than 10,000 applied on behalf of five high school campuses (campuses receiving prior TIF funding or having direct access to the Internet were not eligible).

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30 workstations per entity.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS4)

- Issued: June 4, 1998
- Awarded: December 1, 1998
- Grant Period: January 4, 1999-April 30, 2000
- Recipients: 385 campuses
- \$27.6 million awarded, of which \$25.7 million was expended

- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: District and or campuses within districts with an ADA of less than 40,000 receiving previous TIF funding were not eligible for this initiative. Public schools were divided into three categories based on ADA: 5,000 or fewer students, 5,000-40,000 students, 40,000 or more students. 5,000 or fewer student applied on behalf of the district (districts receiving prior TIF funding were not eligible); 5,000-40,000 applied on behalf of four campuses (districts and/or campuses receiving prior TIF funding were not eligible); 40,000 or greater applied on behalf of four campuses (campuses receiving previous TIF finding were not eligible)

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30 workstations per entity.

Non-Competitive Distance Learning Grants for Public Schools (PS5)

- Issued: June 4, 1998
- Awarded: December 1, 1998
- Grant Period: January 4, 1999-April 30, 2000
- Recipients: 85 school districts representing 95 campuses
- \$6.5 million awarded, of which \$6.4 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: District and or campuses within districts with an ADA of less than 40,000 receiving previous TIF funding were not eligible for this initiative. Public schools were divided into three categories based on ADA: 5,000 or fewer students, 5,000-40,000 students, 40,000 or more students. 5,000 or fewer student applied on behalf of the district (districts receiving prior TIF funding were not eligible); 5,000-40,000 applied on behalf of four campuses (districts and/or campuses receiving prior TIF funding were not eligible); 40,000 or greater applied on behalf of four campuses (campuses receiving previous TIF finding were not eligible)

Grant funds were used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet. Grantees for this grant initiative must have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS6)

- Issued: April 23, 1999
- Awarded: August 13, 1999
- Grant Period: September 1, 1999-November 30, 2000
- Recipients: 1,085 grants awarded to public school districts and campuses
- \$55.8 million awarded, of which \$53 million was expended

- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public school districts with an ADA of less than 10,000 that received a PS4 or PS5 grant were not eligible to apply for funding under this initiative. Districts with an ADA of more than 1,000 applied on behalf of a determined number of campuses. Districts with an ADA of less than 1,000 applied on behalf of the district. This grant initiative combined Technology Advancement and Distance Learning allowing districts to choose a program that would best benefit the needs of given campuses. Grantees were not allowed to implement Technology Advancement and Distance Learning on the same campus. Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30 workstations per entity. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet. Grantees for this grant initiative must have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms before being eligible for Distance Learning.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS7)

- Issued: September 3, 1999
- Awarded: January 14, 2000
- Grant Period: February 1, 2000-April 30, 2001
- Recipients: 183 grants awarded to public school districts and campuses
- \$8.9 million awarded, of which \$7.9 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public school districts and/or campuses with an ADA of less than 10,000 that received a PS4, PS5, or PS6 grant were not eligible to apply for funding under this initiative. Districts with an ADA of more than 1,000 applied on behalf of a determined number of campuses. Districts with an ADA of less than 1,000 applied on behalf of the district. This initiative was released in the same fiscal year to fund districts eligible for PS6 funding that did not apply.

This grant initiative combined Technology Advancement and Distance Learning allowing districts to choose a program that would best benefit the needs of given campuses. Grantees were not allowed to implement Technology Advancement and Distance Learning on the same campus. Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 30

workstations per entity. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet. Grantees for this grant initiative must have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms before being eligible for Distance Learning.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS8)

- Issued: May 25, 2000
- Awarded: August 31, 2000
- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-December 29, 2001
- Recipients: 1,625 campuses
- \$103.2 million awarded, of which \$91.9 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public school districts with an ADA of less than 5,000 that received a PS6 or PS7 grant were not eligible for funding under this initiative. All districts applied on behalf of a determined number of campuses.

This grant initiative combined Technology Advancement and Distance Learning allowing districts to choose a program that would best benefit the needs of given campuses. Districts were allowed to spend funds on both technology advancement and distance learning on each individual campus, if that was desired. Public school campuses that currently lack direct Internet access were given the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, switches, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Districts that had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms on all regular instructional campuses could extend or enhance existing Internet capabilities on any campus within the district. Enhancing Internet capabilities included, but was not limited to, installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchasing additional equipment as listed in the enclosed Configuration List. Applicants that chose to spend funds to enhance existing Internet capabilities must currently have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms on all regular instructional campuses. Additionally, applicants were eligible to utilize TIF funds to provide equipment and appropriate interfaces for distance learning so students could take courses for credit in a location distant from where the courses originate. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer-based image video, data, and voice technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet. Applicants that chose to apply for distance learning must have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms on all regular instructional campuses.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS9)

- Issued: December 1, 2000
- Awarded: May 1, 2001
- Grant Period: May 15, 2001-August 14, 2002
- Recipients: 787 districts representing 1,122 campuses
- \$91.7 million awarded

- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public school districts with an ADA of less than 5,000 that were awarded PS8 grants were not eligible to apply for funding under this initiative. Districts with an ADA of more than 50,000 could apply on behalf of five to 10 campuses. Districts with an ADA of 10,000-49,999 applied on behalf of three to six campuses. Districts with an ADA of 2,500-9,999 could apply for two to four campuses. Districts with an ADA for 500-2,499 could apply for one or two campuses. Districts with less than 500 could only apply for one campus. The campuses could apply for \$50,000 - \$100,000 per eligible campus.

This grant initiative combined Technology Advancement and Distance Learning allowing districts to choose a program that would best benefit the needs of given campuses. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops in classrooms and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements. Applicants were limited to purchasing 50 workstations per funded campus, including any combination of new desktop workstations, laptops, and/or upgrades not to exceed 50 per funded campus. Matching funds could be used to purchase more than 50 workstations. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet. Grantees for this grant initiative must have had networked direct Internet access available in multiple classrooms before being eligible for Distance Learning. Applicants could budget \$7,500 for TIF Tech training or for up to six participants in Distance Learning Methodology training.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (Special Projects)

- Issued: August 31, 2001
- Awarded in three waves: February 2002, May 2002, and August 2002
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-February 28, 2003
- Recipients: 286 districts representing 1,563 campuses
- \$80.7 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: none
- Eligibility Requirements: Any public school campus that had never received TIF funding was eligible to apply for this special project grant initiative.

The purpose of this special project grant was to ensure that every school campus throughout Texas had the opportunity to receive TIF funds, TIF released a Non-Competitive Special Projects grant for all public school campuses that had never received TIF funds. The awarded campuses used the funds to address basic infrastructure needs such as network connectivity, hardware, training, and software. To help encourage even the smallest campuses to apply for funding, TIF simplified the application process and eliminated the requirement for matching funds. Each campus that had not previously received TIF funds was eligible to receive up to \$44,000 to purchase technology.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS10)

- Issued: January 4, 2002
- Awarded: July 1, 2002

- Grant Period: May 20, 2002-April 30, 2003
- Recipients: 528 districts representing 835 campuses
- \$56 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public schools with grades 6-12 campuses were eligible. A campus with grade six as the terminal grade on that campus was not eligible for PS10. The number of eligible campuses is based on District ADA as follows: Districts with an ADA up to 1,500 could apply for one campus, districts with an ADA of 1,501-8,000 could apply for two campuses, Districts of ADA 8,001-20,000 could apply for three campuses, Districts with an ADA of 20,001-70,000 could apply for four campuses, and Districts with an ADA of above 70,000 could apply for five campuses. A District with an ADA is 1,500 or less and any District receiving a PS9 grant, were not eligible for PS10.

This grant initiative allowed these campuses to address their technology and technology training needs. Each individual campus was awarded between \$25,000 and \$100,000, depending on the size of the campus. This grant focused on supporting teacher training so Texas teachers become skilled in using technology and integrating technology into all phases of their lessons. At minimum, 20 percent of the awarded funds were used for staff development in technology. The TIF grant assisted the district in meeting the Texas Education Agency requirement that schools provide Technology Application courses. The remaining funds could be budgeted for continued staff development or equipment necessary to carry out what was learned.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Schools (PS11)

- Issued: January 4, 2002
- Awarded: July 1, 2002
- Grant Period: May 20, 2002-April 30, 2003
- Recipients: 269 districts representing more than 401 campuses
- \$12.7 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Only public school campuses with campuses classified as alternative

The grant money will allow these campuses to address their technology hardware and software needs. Each individual campus was awarded between \$25,000 and \$50,000, depending upon the ADA of the District. These non-competitive grants provided the alternative campuses with funding for new telecommunications equipment, upgraded infrastructure and equipment, and high-speed Internet connectivity. The grant funds were targeted to alternative schools so that the students and instructors would have equitable access to modern technology. Alternative campuses typically provide instruction to at-risk and economically disadvantaged students. These students will have the opportunity to earn technology application credits and become more competitive in the job market upon graduation.

Higher Education

Non-Competitive Infrastructure Grants for Two-Year Community Colleges (HE1)

- Issued: February 11, 1998
- Awarded: May 13, 1998
- Grant Period: July 1, 1998-June 30, 1999

- Recipients: 57 grants awarded
- \$14.8 million awarded, of which \$14.6 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: All two-year community colleges

Grant funds were used to establish LANs in community college libraries so that these libraries would be able to participate in TexShare. Additionally, funds were used to provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for student and/or public access by establishing LANs in educational facilities, academic divisions, and/or student services facilities that lacked networking essentials. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Four-Year Universities and Colleges (HE2)

- Issued: February 24, 1999
- Awarded: May 14, 1999
- Grant Period: July 1, 1999-September 30, 2000
- Recipients: 67 grants awarded
- \$28.1 million awarded, of which \$26.8 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: All four-year colleges and universities

Grant funds were used to establish LANs in college and university libraries so that these libraries would be able to participate in TexShare. Additionally, funds were used to provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for student and/or public access by establishing LANs in educational facilities, academic divisions, and/or student services facilities that lacked networking essentials. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Two and Four-Year Universities and Colleges (HE3)

- Issued: June 1, 2001
- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-December 31, 2002
- Recipients: 120 institutions of higher education
- \$23.8 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Eligible applicants are in general teaching institutions, public two-year colleges, public senior colleges or universities, and private or independent institutions of higher education as referred to in the Texas Education Code 61.003 (3), (4), and (15) or authorized to grant degrees by The Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Grant funds from between \$50,000 and \$850,000, based upon credit hours, were used to provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for student and/or public access by establishing LANs in educational facilities, academic divisions, and/or student services facilities that lacked networking essentials. There was no limitation on how many workstations could be purchased using these grant funds. Grant funds were also used to provide for distance learning equipment so students could take courses in a location distant from where the courses were being presented. For the purposes of this grant initiative, distance learning was defined as computer based image, video and audio technologies integrated into the curriculum and distributed by telecommunications technologies including the Internet.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Two and Four-Year Universities and Colleges (HE4)

- Issued: May 15, 2002
- Awarded: August 26, 2002
- Grant Period: August 30, 2002-August 30, 2003
- Recipients: 104 institutions of higher education representing 123 sites
- \$19.5 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: Eligible applicants are in general academic teaching institutions, public two-year colleges, public senior colleges or universities, and private or independent institutions of higher education as referred to in the Texas Education Code 61.003 (2), (3), (4), (7), (15) and (16).

This grant was designed to expand access and improve quality of pre-service and in-service teacher preparation programs through technology. Funding goals tied to the *Closing the Gaps* report. Some funds will be used to develop and implement the initial or prototypical delivery of courses and other instructional materials to be delivered through distance learning. Access to advanced placement and dual credit courses offered to Texas high school students will be expanded through this grant. High-demand workforce and academic development programs will be developed, improved, and expanded. Funding will also be used to upgrade existing network infrastructure to increase the performance and reliability of services. The higher education institutions will implement approaches to connect the different components of information technology infrastructure—people, applications, platform, and databases—to enable secure, institutional collaborations.

Library

Non-Competitive Internet Connectivity Grants for Public Libraries (LB1)

- Issued: September 2, 1997
- Awarded: January 23, 1998
- Grant Period: February 1, 1998-April 30, 1999
- Recipients: 168 public libraries and branches
- \$3.4 million awarded, of which \$3.1 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: none

Grant funds were awarded to install base level Internet connectivity into facilities that had little or no Internet access. Additionally, funds were used to purchase workstations for public access,

connectivity hardware, cabling, travel to the training funded by TIF, networked laser printers, servers, security software, automation software, and web authoring software.

Non-Competitive Internet Connectivity Grants for Public Libraries (LB2)

- Issued: August 3, 1998
- Awarded: December 1, 1998
- Grant Period: January 4, 1999-March 31, 2000
- Recipients: 39 grants awarded
- \$0.5 million awarded, of which \$0.4 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: none

Grant funds were awarded to install base level Internet connectivity into facilities that had little or no Internet access. Additionally, funds were used to purchase workstations for public access, connectivity hardware, cabling, travel to the training funded by TIF, networked laser printers, servers, security software, automation software, and web authoring software.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Libraries (LB3)

- Issued: August 3, 1998
- Awarded: March 1, 1999
- Grant Period: April 1, 1999-June 30, 2000
- Recipients: 326 public libraries and branches
- \$10 million awarded, of which \$8.4 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: none

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Libraries (LB4)

- Issued: September 14, 1999
- Awarded: March 3, 2000
- Grant Period: April 1, 2000-June 30, 2001
- Recipients: 147 public libraries and branches
- \$6.2 million awarded, of which \$5.3 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 0 percent/10 percent

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements.

Non-Competitive Grants for Public School Libraries (LB5)

- Issued: May 22, 2000
- Awarded: August 31, 2000
- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-August 31, 2001
- Recipients: 232 public school libraries
- \$7.5 million awarded, of which \$6.2 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funds will be used to provide school libraries the necessary equipment and wiring to meet the standards for participation in the Texas Library Connection.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Public Libraries (LB6)

- Issued: June 6, 2000
- Awarded: August 31, 2000
- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-December 29, 2001
- Recipients: 244 public libraries and branches and two collaboratives
- \$9.5 million awarded, of which \$7.8 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 0 percent/10 percent

Grant funds were used to provide entities that currently lacked direct Internet access the opportunity to provide for “inside-the-walls” connectivity by purchasing all the necessary equipment and services for a direct connection, including a T-1 line, router, hubs, CSU/DSU, and associated wiring. Grantees that had base connectivity were allowed to extend or enhance an advanced project by installing additional wiring and/or network drops and/or purchase additional equipment. Additionally, grantees could purchase servers, workstation, printers, and other program enhancements.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Texas Public Libraries (LB7)

- Issued: May 24, 2001
- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-August 31, 2002
- Recipients: 118 public libraries
- \$7.2 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 0 percent/10 percent
- Eligibility: Small public libraries recognized by the Texas State Library or the State Law Library with limited or no Internet access for the general public and branch locations that had never received TIF funds. Public libraries recognized by the Texas State Library or the State Law Library with limited Internet access for the general public and have resources to sustain at least a fractional T-1 were eligible. Libraries with an active LB6 grant were not eligible for this grant, however branches never receiving funding could apply. Any recognized library that had never received funding from TIF was strongly encouraged to apply.

There were two Programs for this grant. Program A could receive a maximum of \$36,000. Program B could apply for up to \$100,000 if there were no branches, and up to \$200,000 for a library with branches and an additional \$30,000 per eligible branch. Public library grantees bought equipment and infrastructure to offer free public Internet access in the library. If a library had never received a grant, they also had to budget for TIF Tech training.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grants for Academic Libraries (LB8)

- Issued: May 24, 2001

- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-August 31, 2002
- Recipients: 115 institutions of higher education
- \$19.9 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: Texas academic libraries in general teaching institutions, public two-year colleges, public senior colleges or universities, and private or independent institutions of higher education as referred to in the Texas Education Code 61.003 (3), (4), and (15) or authorized to grant degrees by the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Medical school libraries were not eligible for this grant initiative.

Provided or augmented broadband connectivity to enhance Internet connections for library users. The funding also provided technology training to the library faculty so that library services could be enhanced. After the grant period, the library catalogs were available on the web and the academic libraries had access to multiple online databases.

Competitive Higher Education Library Technology Advancement (LB9)

- Issued: May 1, 2002
- Awarded: August 9, 2002
- Grant Period: August 31, 2002-August 31, 2003
- Recipients: Nine collaboratives of higher education institutions representing 27 sites
- \$1.6 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: Eligible applicants are Texas academic libraries in general teaching institutions, public two-year colleges, public senior colleges or universities, and private or independent institutions of higher education as referred to in the Texas Education Code 61.003 (3), (4), and (15) or authorized to grant degrees by The Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Health science center libraries in institutions of higher education are eligible applicants.

These grants reached across Texas, extending from Amarillo to Laredo. The cross-section of needs that these colleges addressed is widespread. One collaborative is partnering with its nearby schools and public library to digitize materials and incorporate them into a P-16 curriculum. Another collaborative is creating a Texas History portal with digital information and video that can be accessed from a centralized location. Another collaborative is working closely with health care providers in a 28-county area to deliver streaming nursing videos for educational purposes to students and professionals. The access will be available from hospitals, public libraries, home and the college. Another collaborative is using technology to connect Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) clients to community resources and adult education. Wireless access and sharing digital archival documents is another goal of most of these projects. One library is using technology to digitize historical black films and distribute the collection to schools, community organizations, and museums throughout the state.

Competitive Grant for Texas Public Libraries (LB10)

- Issued: May 1, 2002
- Awarded: August 7, 2002
- Grant Period: August 30, 2002-August 31, 2003
- Recipients: 11 collaboratives of public libraries representing 11 libraries plus branches
- \$1.2 million awarded

- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: Texas public libraries that have legal establishment papers on file at the Texas State Library.

Funding was awarded to projects that showed promise of advancing learning, improving public access, and building partnerships in the state through collaboration. Each proposal focused on different goals. One grantee is focusing on videoconferencing capabilities and training. A few grantees are initiating transforming their websites into English and Spanish, providing bilingual classes and tutoring centers for the Spanish-speaking residents in the area. Another grantee is focusing on providing wireless access so that training classes can be taught to students and parents and laptops can be checked out and used in the vicinity. Yet another grantee will be using funds to make sure technology is accessible for their special needs population.

Non-Competitive Public Library Technology Advancement Grant (LB11)

- Issued: May 9, 2002
- Awarded: August 30, 2002
- Grant Period: August 30, 2002-August 31, 2003
- Recipients: 37 Library Collaboratives
- \$1.5 Million Awarded (open)
- Matching funds required: 0 percent/10 percent
- Eligibility: This grant was available for all public libraries and branches that had never received the benefits of TIF funding. TIF coordinated with the Texas State Library and the Regional Library Systems to assist any public library needing help in submitting an application for funding.

There were two Programs for this grant. Program A could receive a maximum of \$36,000. Program B could apply for up to \$100,000. Funding was awarded so that these libraries will be increasing their resources by adding high-speed Internet access and modern computer equipment for their patrons. This grant opportunity encouraged applicants to expand their current services to include support for patrons with disabilities.

Non-Competitive Texas Public School Library Grant (LB12)

- Issued: May 5, 2002
- Awarded: August 7, 2002
- Grant Period: August 15, 2002-August 15, 2003
- Recipients: 7 school districts representing 761 campus libraries
- \$ 4.8 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility: Eligible districts are the seven districts that had the largest enrollment as of November 2001 based on Texas Education Agency data. The eligible districts are as follows: Houston ISD, Dallas ISD, Fort Worth ISD, Austin ISD, Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, Northside (San Antonio) ISD, and El Paso ISD. Small school districts were not eligible, but would be eligible for another grant with different objectives.

This was a non-competitive grant for the schools' libraries that required grantees to address increasing access to the schools' libraries collections and services. Grantees can use funds for professional development (up to 25 percent of award) related to library services. This grant encouraged progress in hiring sufficient certified librarians to meet the requirements for the

Texas Library Connection membership. The grantees will also train students to become proficient in using web-based automation systems for research.

Non-Competitive Small Texas Public School Library Grant (LB13)

- Issued: May 20, 2002
- Awarded: August 7, 2002
- Grant Period: August 15, 2002-August 15, 2003
- Recipients: 108 school district libraries
- \$3.1 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: none
- Eligibility: Eligible districts are districts with one regular instructional campus, an enrollment of less than 500 ADA, and current membership in the Texas Library Connection (TLC).

Small, single, rural campus districts can enhance their existing access to TLC resources for students and teachers. More than 100 public school districts received approximately \$30,000 each so the libraries can build the necessary technology infrastructure to support the TLC. These schools will develop or enhance web-based automations systems, provide video streaming resources, provide access to the TLC, and provide upgrades and modifications to the hardware or software to raise the level of service for the end-users. Training was also a significant aspect of this initiative.

Non-Competitive Small Texas Public School Library Grant (LB14)

- Issued: May 20, 2002
- Awarded: August 7, 2002
- Grant Period: August 15, 2002-August 15, 2003
- Recipients: 39 school district libraries
- \$1.1 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: none
- Eligibility: Districts with an enrollment of less than 500 students per district as reported through PEIMS to TEA; are not currently active members of TLC according to Texas Library Connection Information Center; and have a basic library collection. The school library materials may include books, video and audiotapes. Items must be in a central location and available for all students and staff to check out and use.

Small, single campus school districts received TIF funding to get their libraries connected to a resource of databases. This grant removes the barriers for small schools to become members of the TLC. Approximately 40 public school libraries will receive up to \$30,000 each in order to increase the technology infrastructure to support the TLC. The funds will allow these small school districts to provide a year's worth of training to support the TLC requirement of having a certified librarian to supervise the library.

Health Care

Competitive Clinical Telemedicine Demonstration Grant (PH1)

- Issued: August 28, 1998
- Awarded: March 15, 1999

- Grant Period: May 1, 1999-April 30, 2001
- Recipients: 20 collaborative projects in which 63 not-for-profit healthcare facilities partnered with 8 health science centers
- \$7.4 million awarded, of which \$6.7 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funding was awarded for projects that utilize telecommunications-based systems and services to enhance or establish new healthcare services to patients. Grant funds under this initiative were to be used to purchase telemedicine equipment and peripherals to provide consultative, diagnostic, and other medical services, including the provision of medical information, via telecommunications technologies. Grantees were required to partner with a Health Science Center.

Non-Competitive Telemedicine Internet Connectivity Grant (PH2)

- Issued: August 28, 1998
- Awarded: January 15, 1999
- Grant Period: March 1, 1999-May 31, 2000
- Recipients: 21 collaborative projects in which 328 not-for-profit healthcare facilities partnered with eight health science centers
- \$14 million awarded, of which \$13.7 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funding was awarded to projects for telehealth/telemedicine connectivity via the Internet that enables healthcare facilities to enhance or establish new access to health information systems. Grant funds allowed healthcare facilities to purchase servers, routers, switches, other related networking equipment, workstations, and related telecommunications services. Grantees were required to partner with a Health Science Center.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grant for Not-for-Profit Hospitals and Clinics (PH3)

- Issued: October 25, 1999
- Awarded: March 15, 2000
- Grant Period: April 1, 2000-March 31, 2001
- Recipients: 22 collaborative projects comprised of 357 not-for-profit healthcare facilities and 13 “stand alone” not-for-profit healthcare facilities
- \$20.1 Million Awarded, of which \$16.5 million was expended
- Matching funds required: 10 percent

Grant funding was awarded to increase Internet connectivity, provide public access to medical information, and provide telemedicine services for direct patient care. Grant funds allowed healthcare facilities to establish LANs of at least 100 Megabits per second (Mbps); provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for public access to medical information of value for patients and healthcare professionals; purchase public access terminals or kiosks; and install telemedicine telecommunications equipment in order to provide clinical services for direct patient care.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grant for Health Science Centers (PH4)

- Issued: October 25, 1999
- Awarded: February 1, 2000
- Grant Period: March 1, 2000-February 28, 2001

- Recipients: 10 health science centers
- \$9.7 million awarded, of which \$9.4 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funds were awarded to establish LANs of at least 100 Mbps; provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for public access to medical information of value for patients and healthcare professionals; purchase public access terminals or kiosks; purchase new equipment and/or upgrade existing equipment for classrooms, conference rooms, and/or clinical facilities to support synchronous, interactive videoconferencing including multi-media support capabilities; establish or upgrade telemedicine equipment in order to provide clinical services for patient care, including special telemedicine peripheral devices.

Non-Competitive Grant for Local Health Departments (PH5)

- Issued: May 22, 2000
- Awarded: August 31, 2000
- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-December 29, 2001
- Recipients: 63 city and county health departments
- \$3.7 million awarded, of which \$3.7 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funding was awarded to increase Internet connectivity, provide public access to medical information, and provide telemedicine services for direct patient care. Grant funds allowed healthcare facilities to establish LANs of at least 100 Mbps; provide “inside-the-walls” connectivity for public access to medical information of value for patients and healthcare professionals; purchase public access terminals or kiosks; and install telemedicine telecommunications equipment in order to provide clinical services for direct patient care. Additionally, funds were awarded to allow Local Health Departments to purchase the necessary equipment to participate in statewide public health initiatives including the state’s Health Alert Network.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grant for Eligible Healthcare Entities (HC6)

- Issued: May 18, 2001
- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-August 31, 2002
- Recipients: 41 lead applicants and 431 collaborative members
- \$23.4 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public not-for-profit healthcare facilities, public not-for-profit behavioral healthcare providers, public school based clinics that provide primary care services within scope of practice as defined by state law.

The intent of this grant was to stimulate collaborative projects with a clear, sustainable model for the delivery of clinical services or applications with a measurable impact on the community. This was achieved through increased connectivity to the Internet; the provision of public access to medical information; the support of distance learning education and/or the provision of telemedicine services for direct patient care. Grantees established LANs, provided public access for medical information, purchased new equipment and upgraded existing equipment for distance learning, clinic facilities, and purchased telemedicine equipment and peripherals.

Non-Competitive Technology Advancement Grant for Academic Health Science Centers (HC7)

- Issued: May 18, 2001
- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-August 31, 2002
- Recipients: 10 academic health science centers
- \$9.9 million awarded, of which \$9.9 million was expended
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Medical School and/or health Science Centers and Affiliated health Science Center Libraries authorized in the Texas education Code.

The intent of this grant initiative was to provide funds to the Academic Health Science Centers and Affiliated Health Science Center Libraries to increase connectivity to the Internet; to provide public health access to medical information; and to support distance learning education and/or provide telemedicine services for direct patient care.

Competitive/Non-Competitive Technology Advancement grant for Eligible Healthcare Entities (HC8)

- Issued: May 6, 2002
- Awarded: July 29, 2002
- Grant Period: August 15, 2002-August 31, 2003
- Recipients: 58 awards to 247 entities
- \$21.3 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent
- Eligibility Requirements: Public, non-profit hospitals, healthcare and behavioral health facilities, public health departments and health science centers. Awards based upon a mix of competitive and non-competitive elements in the RFP.

The intent of this program is to develop sustainable models for the delivery of primary care; health care education; professional development and public health services through applications and programs with a measurable impact on the community. This was a highly competitive grant allows the health care facilities to use telemedicine to transcend travel boundaries and time to diagnose patients, to educate patients, to teach other physicians at a distance, and to share information among sites. Although some are concerned with electronic medical records and transactions, these grant funds will also be used to install technology supporting patient privacy. These efforts are designed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of health care delivery through increased connectivity to the Internet; the provision of public access to medical information; the support of distance-learning education and/or the provision of telemedicine services for direct patient care.

Discovery

Competitive Discovery Project Grants (DI1)

- Issued: November 10, 1997
- Awarded: August 14, 1998
- Grant Period: January 4, 1999-June 30, 2000
- Recipients: 11 collaborative projects comprised of 20 institutions of higher education, 51 public school campuses and districts, 14 not-for-profit healthcare facilities, and two libraries
- \$9.7 million awarded, of which \$9.5 million was expended

■ Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funds were awarded to “out-of-the-box” projects that used a variety of innovative technologies to solve everyday problems. Grant requests included distance learning equipment, laptop computers, telemedicine equipment and peripherals, training, scheduling software, and other “bleeding” edge technologies.

Competitive Discovery Project Grants (DI2)

■ Issued: December 1998

■ Awarded: August 26, 1999

■ Grant Period: September 1, 1999-February 28, 2001

■ Recipients: 15 collaborative projects comprised of 62 school districts, 68 institutions of higher education, 22 not-for-profit healthcare facilities, and three libraries

■ \$6.8 million awarded, of which \$5.8 million was expended

■ Matching funds required: 10 percent

Grant funds were awarded to “out-of-the-box” projects that used a variety of innovative technologies to solve everyday problems. Grant requests included distance learning equipment, laptop computers, telemedicine equipment and peripherals, training, scheduling software, and other “bleeding” edge technologies.

Competitive Discovery Project Grants (DI3)

■ Issued: June 7, 2000

■ Awarded: August 31, 2000

■ Grant Period: October 2, 2000-March 29, 2002

■ Recipients: Six collaborative projects comprised of 35 institutions of higher education, seven school districts, three academic health science centers, three not-for-profit healthcare facilities, and one public library

■ \$4.1 million awarded, of which \$2.9 million was expended

■ Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funds were awarded to “out-of-the-box” projects that used a variety of innovative technologies to solve everyday problems. Grant requests included distance learning equipment, laptop computers, telemedicine equipment and peripherals, training, scheduling software, and other “bleeding” edge technologies.

Competitive Discovery Project Grants (DI4)

■ Issued: August 24, 2000

■ Awarded: March 9, 2001

■ Grant Period: May 7, 2001-March 30, 2003

■ Recipients: 27 higher education collaboratives representing 141 sites

■ \$18.1 million awarded

■ Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

This highly competitive Discovery grant was awarded to institutions of higher education that showed innovative uses of distance learning through videoconferencing. Collaborative initiatives were encouraged. Many of these grantees collaborated with other institutions of higher education and public schools, fostering the K-16 initiatives.

Competitive Discovery Project Grants (DI5)

- Issued: May 8, 2002
- Awarded: August 16, 2002
- Grant Period: August 30, 2002-March 31, 2004
- Recipients: 12 collaboratives representing 68 sites
- \$5.5 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

The different proposals provided technology solutions for everyday problems within the collaboratives. One collaborative of schools in the Austin area will use technology to foster more specialized education for those with emotional and behavioral disorders. Another collaborative of Uvalde health care professionals will create a database of digitized resources to assist with migrant and farmer worker health care needs. Cuero's hospital and school district is teaming up with two other school districts to address school nurse shortages. A project in the Houston area is focusing on a low-income community where they will teach language classes, job skills, and education advancement through technology. Teacher shortage and technology professional development was a common problem that a few of the projects addressed. In south Texas, for instance, community colleges are teaming up to provide teacher certification programs via distance learning to assist with the teacher shortages. The Texas A&M University System is also working on courses and a resource repository to help attract more potential teachers to become certified. Two other projects are creating web portals to provide staff development and deliver educational services to low-income, minority schools and their communities.

Community Networking

Competitive Community Networking Planning Grants (CN1)

- Issued: July 15, 1999
- Awarded: January 14, 2000
- Grant Period: February 1, 2000-May 19, 2000
- Recipients: 54 collaborative planning grants awarded
- \$1.1 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Grant funds were awarded to assist grantees in creating plans to develop community networks.

Competitive Community Networking Implementation Grants (CN1)

- Issued: July 15, 1999
- Awarded: August 11, 2000
- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-September 30, 2002
- Recipients: 36 collaborative community networking projects comprised of 189 TIF-eligible entities (79 school districts, 27 institutions of higher education, 49 not-for-profit healthcare facilities and academic health science centers, and 34 libraries)
- \$17.4 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Community Networking Grants were awarded to provide communities a means of providing public access to technology resources for all community members regardless of location, economic condition, ethnicity, education, or prior skills; encourage local planning and development of an information infrastructure that will provide a central repository of local content, resources and a means to participate in the digital revolution; provide funding to train

community members within the community network to use the technology, to increase their awareness of technology, and to empower them through its use.

Competitive Community Networking Implementation Grants (CN2)

- Issued: May 17, 2001
- Awarded: August 31, 2001
- Grant Period: August 31, 2001-April 30, 2003
- Recipients: 61 collaboratives comprised of more than 600 entities
- \$30.5 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

Community Networking Grants were awarded to provide communities a means of providing public access to technology resources for all community members regardless of location, economic condition, ethnicity, education, or prior skills; encourage local planning and development of an information infrastructure that will provide a central repository of local content, resources and a means to participate in the digital revolution; provide funding to train community members within the community network to use the technology, to increase their awareness of technology, and to empower them through its use.

Non-Competitive Grant for Community Networking (CN3)

- Issued: April 1, 2002
- Awarded: July 8, 2002
- Grant Period: July 15, 2002-September 30, 2003
- Recipients: 91 collaboratives representing 629 sites
- \$22.5 million awarded
- Matching Funds Required: 10 percent

The TIF Community Networking Grant program was completely redesigned and refocused with this grant. Key changes are the shift from a competitive to non-competitive grant structure, the development of community training and toolkits to assist communities in developing networks and the targeting of extremely rural and urban underserved areas of the state. Ninety-one communities throughout Texas are on the verge of building their own community networks with grant funding from the Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund (TIF) Board. Rural counties and urban empowerment zones, enterprise communities, or enhanced enterprise communities were each awarded \$250,000 from TIF to plan, develop, implement, and deploy a technology and human network. The community networks focus on community web portals, public access sites, and technology training for the general public. This was the first non-competitive community networking grant initiative.

Special Projects

The TIF Board has voted to provide 13 special project grants to individual entities for specific purposes. Board-authorized special projects are outside TIF's normal grant development and award process. These 13 projects are summarized below, in order of the first date of their respective grant periods.

University of Texas at Austin General Libraries Representing the Texas Digital Library Alliance

- Grant Period: November 1, 1999-July 31, 2001

- \$205,240 awarded, of which \$131,493 was expended

The Texas Digital Library Alliance (TDLA) project focused on the development and establishment of an on-line repository of archival resources for use by every Texan who has access to an Internet-connected computer. TDLA consists Rice University, Texas A&M University, Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Texas Tech University, the University of Houston, and the University of Texas at Austin.

A wide variety of types of materials would be made available in the archive. The proposed project would be made available to all libraries, archives and museums in the state. The underlying basis of the digital archive would be the descriptions of the collections, or finding aids, created by the institutions that hold the material. The finding aids would be marked up using Encoded Archival Description (EAD), a new standard for making finding aids available on the web. EAD is a data structure standard for archival finding aids that is based on the SGML (Standard Generalized Markup Language) and XML (Extensible Markup Language), standards for the creation and storage of documents. EAD-encoded finding aids will facilitate much more sophisticated navigation, searching, and retrieval of information on the Web than is currently possible using HTML.

The digital archive that was proposed would positively impact “the lives of virtually every Texan”. It would enhance K-12 education by making available a wealth of culturally significant documents and images to schoolchildren throughout the state. It would also enable teachers to incorporate online material into their curricula and to use the archive for homework assignments. Graduate students and university faculty would find this resource useful for teaching and research. Citizens of the state would be able to find historically significant resources in relation not just to Texas, but also to the entire world. TIF funds would assisted with the initial phase of the project.

Texas State Library and Archives Commission (Two Grants)

Phase One

- Grant Period: October 2, 2000-June 30, 2001
- Recipients: 600 public and academic libraries
- \$7.4 million awarded, of which \$7.4 million was expended
- Matching funds required: 10 percent

Phase Two

- Grant Period: September 1, 2001-August 31, 2003
- Recipients: 600 public and academic libraries
- \$13.3 million initially awarded, and an additional \$1 million has since been awarded
- Matching funds required: 10 percent

The Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund Board initially approved a two-year grant to the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) for the Library of Texas. The Library of Texas executive summary states in part that “the Library will deliver information when, where and how Texans want it”. The summary further states that “a broad range of information services will be provided to school children, parents, business owners and others across Texas, including:

- Online databases, putting thousands of full-text books, reference materials, and journals on the desktop – even in the most remote locales;

- Current and retrospective electronic state government information;
- A statewide catalog that allows customers to identify holdings in libraries statewide, determine their availability, and request those items – in one search session; and
- Extensive training to help librarians and their customers gain full benefits from these rich information resources.”

The Library of Texas amended proposal indicates a five-year project with a budget of approximately \$71.3 million. TIF funding over this five-year period is approximately \$44.7 million and TSLAC funding over this same period of approximately \$26.6 million.

This was a grant initiative with 2 distinct phases. Phase 1 of the Library of Texas project has provided approximately 600 public and academic libraries with access to approximately 60 database subscriptions. The database subscriptions will provide shared access to Texas’ academic, public, public/school combination and state governmental agency libraries and to the registered users of these libraries through TSLAC’s Library Resource Sharing Program. The majority of the database subscriptions are 12-month subscriptions ending on June 30, 2002. Previously these databases were subscribed to individually by libraries or accessed through the TSLAC on a fee basis. Most rural and under funded public libraries across Texas did not have access to the resources the TIF-funded database subscriptions now provide. TSLAC management indicates in fiscal year 1999, online database subscriptions provided by the TSLAC would have cost individual libraries more than \$20 million – ten times their actual cost to the state.

For Phase Two, TIF funding includes approximately \$7.4 million in funding for database subscriptions as described in Phase 1 and includes additional funds for service contracts and various equipment to include network hardware, computers and videoconferencing equipment. An additional \$1 million was awarded, with a grant period beginning July 15, 2002, for acquisition of medical and other specialized health databases. A 10 percent matching fund was required for this additional award.

Brazos-Sabine Connection

- Grant Period: August 29, 2001-August 31, 2002
- \$2.2 million awarded

The Brazos-Sabine Connection is a consortium of school districts in rural, Southeast Texas that has taken advantage of the state’s technology investment. The consortium was established to facilitate management and delivery of instructional and leadership development activities.

Districts and campuses will first address the recruitment and retention of teachers in critical curriculum areas. Self-selected campuses from experienced districts within the consortium will bring together necessary components for systemic school-wide improvement. As a result, professional development will be broadened to enable all teachers and administrators to learn more technology and teaching skills that can work across multiple-access models; school administrators and other school leaders will become aware of the planning and implementation of technology in schools and classrooms; new strategies for recruiting and retaining essential curriculum teachers will be developed through web-based and distance learning technologies; communication and collaboration for improved student-centered learning will be fostered through up-to-date digital resources, school-wide integration of technology, curriculum, and

instruction will be implemented to improve learning; and school-wide technology integration will be evaluated based on student learning, teacher quality, recruitment and retention, and management of implementation.

The Brazos-Sabine Connection provides opportunities for other districts to become members of the consortium. Building capacity by increasing the resources, both human and technological, within the district will be the major focus of the work in the new districts. The collaboration among the veteran school districts and isolated communities should provide a positive impact.

There are two phases to this project: capacity building and systemic school-wide improvement. Capacity Building includes Teacher Professional Development for new and experienced technology users and Administrator and Leadership Development. Teachers will be given the opportunity over time to develop new skills or build upon their integration of technology in the classroom to facilitate their personal and professional use of technology. As an incentive to commit to this program for one year, teachers will receive a laptop. If a teacher already has a laptop, peripheral devices will be offered as incentives to join the program. School administrators from each new district participating in the consortium will receive a laptop and will meet with other administrators from the consortium. Through quarterly meetings, activities will be encouraged to increase administrators' understanding and support of technology integration. Incentives offered to all participants in each program will benefit the district by providing up-to-date technology equipment, tools, and resources to support learning.

Systemic school-wide improvement and evaluation includes building upon evaluation results of the school-wide activities in the consortium. The new districts will identify one or two schools to participate in systemic school-wide improvement. An evaluation process will be developed to focus on documenting the potential of technology integration in maximizing student achievement, improving teacher quality, and improving teacher recruitment and retention.

Intel Teach to the Future Program

- Grant period: August 29, 2001-August 31, 2002
- \$4 million awarded

The Intel Teach to the Future Program is focused on showing teachers how to use technology effectively in the curriculum. Master Teachers will be taught from a curriculum proven to increase the number of teachers using computers in instruction by 84 percent and increase student learning. With the TIF funding, over a two-year period, 200 Master Teachers will be recruited and trained. Each Master Teacher will then train at least 20 participating classroom teachers per year up through the end of fiscal year 2003. Therefore, number of teachers trained from this project will be at least 4,000 in Texas alone.

The curriculum, which consists of 10 four-hour modules, is based in the Microsoft Office 2000 Professional software suite. Training includes the use of the Internet, web page design, and multimedia software usage. Teachers learn how, when, and where to incorporate technology tools and resources into their current lesson plans, create assessment tools, and align lessons with district, state, and national standards.

Key private sector and higher education partners in Texas include Microsoft, Hewlett-Packard, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Dell Computer, and the Colleges of Education at Texas A&M University and University of North Texas.

Internet 2 Study

- Grant Period: August 29, 2001-March 31, 2002
- \$30,000 awarded, of which all was expended
- Matching funds required: None

This award funded a proposal jointly submitted and funded to Texas A&M University and The University of Texas at Austin. The grant was for the undertaking of a project feasibility assessment study regarding the Internet2 Abilene Network (Internet2 or I2). Internet2 is designed to support educational institutions in the United States and is connected to several similar network initiatives across the globe. Internet2 offers K-20 constituents the benefit of an additional, cost-effective route to add to their traditional commodity Internet connections, as well as, access to a high capacity network that allows collaborative initiatives with other educational entities connected to I2.

Texas Public Broadcasting Educational Network and Texas A&M University Building a Statewide Digital Community

- Grant period: August 29, 2001-August 31, 2003
- \$20 million awarded

Digital transmission allows technologically enhanced capability for the transmission of significant video programs and data with high quality pictures and sound. The Texas Public Broadcasting Association is obtaining funding to digitize their systems. Access to this digital transmission will allow increased services, including the dedication to educational services, to a broader population of citizens across Texas.

A significant number of Texans are without access to the world of information. This insufficient access is due, in part, to the difficulty of getting high speed transmission lines to many geographic and population areas. However, many of these areas and populations already have access to cable TV and the access its transmission capabilities provide. It is estimated that 95 percent of the population of Texas is within the viewing range of a Texas Public Television station.

The ability of cable TV to upgrade its transmission capabilities to digital will provide the ability to transmit high speed information to residences, small businesses, underserved populations, and citizens in general. This effort will help equalize educational opportunities, independent of their demographic or geographic situation.

Non-commercial, non-profit public broadcasting offers resources in the development of education and cultural material to transmit over the digital lines. All of the state's fourteen public broadcasting stations will be involved in the project. The collaboration is called the Texas Public Broadcast Education Network (TPBEN). The result from this collaboration will be the first over-the-air education network for the State of Texas and its citizens. The network will deliver content directly to students, teachers, libraries, and residences.

The collaborative effort will include state educators, agencies, and media professionals, including the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), and the Virtual College of Texas, to develop content, evaluation, and other criteria. The TPBEN will also connect important content sources such as universities, colleges, museums, concert halls, etc. to all Texans, as well as educational materials and services developed by sources from across the nation.

University of North Texas

■ Grant period: August 31, 2001-July 31, 2002

■ \$128,000 awarded

The Texas Center for Digital Knowledge, University of North Texas, will implement a Needs Assessment Study of Texas Academic, Public, and School Libraries. The objectives of this study are to document the current infrastructure, content, and training capabilities of a stratified random sample of Texas academic, public, and school libraries; identify perceived user needs of each type of library; determine difference between current capabilities and perceived user needs of each type of library; identify types of TIF grants to address the gap between capabilities and needs; determine probable costs of such TIF grants; and prepare a document that provides background and identifies potential outcome and evaluation measures for TIF grants.

University of North Texas/Voyager University Project

■ Grant period: October 23, 2001-August 31, 2002

■ \$2.2 million awarded

The University of North Texas/Voyager University project is an effort to address teacher preparation so they can maximize technology applications in the K-12 classroom. To adequately provide our children with essential educational experiences, lead teachers must be taught how to effectively use technology applications. In this two-year effort, the proposed Senior Technology Applications Academy Pilot will enroll 1,200 teachers from across the state in four graduate level courses. The Texas Education Agency has implemented five new technology courses of study within the secondary school curriculum: Web Mastering, Desktop Publishing, Digital Graphics/Animation, Multimedia, and Video Technology.

Each school district in Texas is expected to provide instruction in these areas and therefore must have competent teachers to teach such courses. The University of North Texas, in partnership with state agencies and corporate partners, will attempt to meet the identified needs.

Two levels of teacher credentials are attainable through the project. First, UNT provides an “All Level” Certificate in Technology Applications upon participant completion of the Intel Teach to the Future Effort and the first of the four graduate courses included in this project. The second credential will be a State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) “Senior Level” Certificate in Technology Applications obtained upon completion of the next three courses in the sequence. Moreover, for those desiring to continue their education, a Masters degree from UNT will be available.

The project is a collaborative effort between partners throughout the state and nation. Partners include Texas Center for Education Technology (TCET), University of North Texas (UNT),

Texas Education Agency (TEA), Texas Board for Education Certification (SBEC), Voyager University, and Super Collider Opportunities for Public Education (SCOPE).

Over a two-year period, three groups of teachers will be recruited. In Fall 2001, 120 teachers were enrolled. In Spring 2002, 480 teachers were enrolled. In Summer 2002, 600 teachers were enrolled. The end result will be 1,200 teachers with the knowledge to not only teach students through technology, but teach other teachers as well.

University of Texas at Austin Representing Applied Research Laboratories (ARL:UT)

■ Grant period: April 1, 2002-November 30, 2002

■ \$299,710 awarded

The Applied Research Laboratories, University of Texas at Austin, will define a K-12 Technology needs Assessment. The goal of this effort is to assess the current status of and needs of Texas K-12 Technology infrastructure in order to support the Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund Board's and the Texas Legislature's determination of future funding priorities. The proposed assessment shall survey the current state of K-12 technology assets (determine infrastructure to include connectivity to each district and campus, server configuration in each district and campus, WAN and LAN support, classroom connectivity, computers in classrooms, laboratories, and administrative offices, software applications in use, and multi-media instruction in the classroom); survey the impact of current K-12 technology assets for specified educational goals; survey K-12 technology needs for specified educational goals; provide a "rolling" infrastructure baseline database for use in future technology assessments; provide a briefing summarizing current state of the infrastructure and recommendations for future directions; and provide a final report summarizing results and recommendations for input into the TIFB legislative appropriations request.

University of Texas at Austin representing the Applied research Laboratories Healthcare Needs Assessments

■ Grant period: June 1, 2002-January 31, 2003

■ \$299,787 awarded

The purpose of this project is to perform a comprehensive needs assessment of TIF eligible healthcare entities. The hospital administrator, IT director and direct care staff in a sample of the 1300 TIF eligible entities will be surveyed to determine technology infrastructure needs. The results of this project will provide direction for future healthcare funding as well as providing important information on the state of telecommunications infrastructure in the healthcare field.

Texas A&M University Representing the Dr. Jon Denton Study

■ Grant period: August 7, 2002-August 31, 2003

■ \$58,177 awarded

The purpose of this study is to determine the level of integration of technology in the instructional programs of Texas public schools. District level information will be sought about the type and amount of telecommunications connectivity, the amount of equipment, the level of use of internet based instructional applications, the amount and kind of professional development for professional staff, the technology outreach efforts to school patrons, and the financial resources dedicated to technology provided by the district. This study is one of several reports by Dr. Denton attempting to capture the impact of TIF dollars over time.

The University of Texas at Austin representing The Telecommunications and Information Policy Institute

Community Networking 1 Evaluation Study

- Grant period: August 29, 2002-March 31, 2003
- \$338,813 Awarded

This joint grant between the LBJ School of Public Affairs and the Telecommunications and Information Policy Institute will provide an in-depth analysis of the first round of TIF community network grants. A team of graduate students at the LBJ School of Public Affairs is working in the field to determine the impact of TIF community networking dollars. This research will not only inform the TIF community network grant program, but will provide valuable data to advance the global community network movement.

Legislative Appropriations

The Legislature has allocated some of TIF's available funding to other state agencies. Almost \$126 million has been appropriated to other agencies through 2002:

- Texas Education Agency (\$108.6 million);
- Health and Human Services Commission (\$11.0 million);
- Texas State Library and Archives Commission (\$2.9 million);
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (\$1.4 million);
- State Board for Educator Certification (\$1.1 million); and
- Texas Department of Health (\$0.8 million).

These transfers represent 11 percent of TIF's overall spending programs. For fiscal year 2003, the Legislature has transferred \$36.2 million to other agencies. These six agencies' legislative appropriations requests for the upcoming biennium seek \$35.1 million and \$22.5 million of TIF funds for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, respectively. If enacted, the total funds appropriated to other agencies would reach \$220 million. TIF has no operational oversight of funds appropriated to other agencies.

APPENDIX H: TRANSMISSION LINE SITING PROCESS

Outlined below is the basic process used by the transmission service providers (TSP) in Texas to determine a preferred route for a transmission line. Variations among the utilities have been noted. This process is not completely defined by rule, and it has evolved over time.

First, need for the transmission line must be determined. Planning engineers of the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) will perform the following Transmission Planning Process in cooperation with the TSP in the Regional Transmission Planning Groups:

- Evaluate constraints and perform studies with the Planning Groups to identify possible solutions;
- Propose needed bulk transmission facility additions based on identified constraints;
- Conduct an open process of public review and comment on proposed facility additions through committees;
- Submit all final recommended bulk/large transmission facility additions to the ERCOT Board of Directors for review and concurrence;
- Determine the designated TSP of the additions; and
- Notify the Public Utility Commission of Texas (PUC) of all Board supported transmission facility additions and their designated providers.

Projects proposed by interested parties may be submitted to ERCOT for review and considered for endorsement according to PUC rules. The particular aspects of ERCOT's planning process were adopted by the ERCOT Board in 1999 and filed with the PUC.²⁸⁶

In the next step, the TSP completes an Environmental Assessment and Routing Study, a process that takes nine to 12 months. This process begins when the TSP selects the end points of the transmission project to best address the identified need. Once these are selected, the TSP selects a routing consultant. Some utilities will get bids from several consultants. Others prefer to use only one or two consultants and select the one who is available. The chosen consultant will select the study area for approval by the TSP. The width of the study area will vary according to the length of the line and the nature of the area traversed, but will be large enough to allow routing to avoid sensitive areas.²⁸⁷ In rural areas, the study area could be 15 to 20 miles wide, whereas in urban areas it may only be a mile wide.

Aerial photographs, contacts with governmental agencies, and limited ground surveillance are used to identify sensitive areas and preliminary constraint maps are produced. Features are

²⁸⁶ PUC Project No. 21293 and PUC Subst. R. §25.197(f)(3).

²⁸⁷ In general, residential areas, parks and recreation areas, historical sites, known locations of threatened or endangered species, and similar areas are considered sensitive.

located that may be used for a transmission corridor.²⁸⁸ The routing consultant will identify multiple line segments that are combined to create alternate line routes.

The TSP and consultant organize and conduct one or more public meetings that present possible routes and gather input from the public. Public comments are encouraged during and after the meeting. Multiple meetings may be held for long lines, or when additional alternate routes are considered after the initial meeting. Notice for the public meeting is provided to newspapers, radio stations and is posted in public areas. Mail notice is sent to landowners within 200 feet of potential routes. A preferred route is not identified until after the public meeting.²⁸⁹

The consultant will assemble its experts to discuss alternate routes and the input from public meetings, agency contacts, and field investigations. The alternative routes are evaluated taking into account relevant impacts and construction costs as well as the cost and reliability of other options. The list of alternate routes is narrowed during this evaluation by adding or dropping route segments. The consultant will select a preferred route and alternate routes considering geographical diversity, number of habitable structures within 200 feet, and the use of existing right-of-way and property lines.²⁹⁰ These routes will be presented to the TSP for final selection. The TSP will consider line design, cost, community values, historical and archeological values, environmental integrity, and related issues during the review of the alternates.²⁹¹

Once the preferred and alternative routes are selected, the TSP prepares a CCN application using a standard PUC form.²⁹² The consultant prepares an environmental assessment of the final study area which includes the preferred route and alternates. This step in the process takes about two months.

The TSP then files the applications and environmental assessment with the PUC. The TSP runs notices in newspaper having general circulation in the counties where the CCN is being requested once each week for two consecutive weeks beginning the week following the filing.²⁹³ The TSP also mails notice to directly affected land owners on the preferred and alternative

²⁸⁸ Pipelines, other transmission lines, fence lines, abandoned railroad tracks, and similar existing uses of rights of way will be identified during this process.

²⁸⁹ A public meeting is required by PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a) if 25 or more landowners are affected by the proposed transmission line route. Oncor Electric Delivery Company (TXU) provides mail notice to landowners within 500 feet of potential routes.

²⁹⁰ The preferred and alternative routes should not be substantially identical alternatives. For purposes of this process, a "habitable structure" is defined by PUC Subst. R. §25.101(c)(6)(C) as structures that are normally inhabited by humans on a daily, or regular, basis including single-family dwellings and related structures, apartment buildings, businesses, major additions to the aforementioned types of pre-existing structures, and mobile home parks.

²⁹¹ These include considerations such as the permits and approvals required from other governmental agencies and distances from communication installations, airstrips, and traveling irrigation systems.

²⁹² The form is available online at <http://www.puc.state.tx.us/electric/forms/ccnapp.cfm> (accessed November 25, 2002).

²⁹³ PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a)(1) specifies the content of these notices.

locations of the proposed line.²⁹⁴ Municipalities and neighboring utilities within 5 miles of the requested facility and the county governments of all counties in which any portion of the proposed facility is located will be given notice.²⁹⁵ Proof of notice must be filed with the PUC no later than 20 days after filing of the application.²⁹⁶

Once proof of notice has been filed, the PUC begins its review process. The PUC must render a decision within one year of the date of filing of a completed application, unless good cause is shown for exceeding that period. If a line is deemed critical by ERCOT, the action by the PUC on the application must be taken within 180 days. If there is no intervention within 45 days, then the application shall be approved administratively within 80 days from the date of the filing.²⁹⁷

If a CCN application is contested, the PUC prepares a proposed Preliminary Order, which addresses the issues raised by the TSP and the intervenors, and refers the proceeding to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH). An administrative law judge is appointed by SOAH. The judge advises parties on how to intervene or become a protestant. Individuals interested in intervening do not need to be represented by an attorney.²⁹⁸ After discussions with the parties at a pre-hearing conference, the judge will issue a procedural schedule. The TSP will prepare and file testimony addressing the issues.

The judge will encourage the parties to hold settlement discussions or mediation. If necessary, the judge will approve an abatement of the procedural schedule to give time for negotiating settlement and require status reports as negotiations proceed. If the parties reach an agreement, a settlement is filed and the proceeding is returned to the PUC, which will prepare a proposed order. If no settlement is reached by the parties, then the PUC staff and intervenors prepare and file testimony.

The judge conducts a hearing so that parties can present their evidence. Parties then prepare post-hearing briefs, and the judge prepares a Proposal for Decision. PUC staff schedules the deliberation on the case by the commissioners at an Open Meeting. The commissioners may approve, modify, or deny the application. Motions for rehearing may be filed by any party, and parties have the right to appeal the commissioners' decision to the Travis County District Court.

A final notice is provided to all landowners who had previously received direct notice to inform them of the commission's order.²⁹⁹ The TSP surveys the approved route and starts the acquisition of the right-of-way and necessary permits. Affected landowners are contacted by the TSP or contractors. Easement agreements, at a minimum, must include a provision prohibiting

²⁹⁴ PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a)(3) provides that land is directly affected if an easement would be obtained over all or portion of it, or if it contains a habitable structure that would be within 200 feet of the proposed facility.

²⁹⁵ PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a)(2).

²⁹⁶ PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a)(3)(D).

²⁹⁷ PUC Subst. R. §§ 25.101(c)(4) and (5).

²⁹⁸ The judge may request the PUC counsel to assist intervenors representing themselves with procedural matters.

²⁹⁹ PUC Proc. R. §22.52(a)(6).

the new construction of habitable structures within the right-of-way.³⁰⁰ The TSP makes arrangements for any ordered archeological or wildlife survey once permission has been obtained to go on the approved right-of-way before construction begins.

The TSP orders equipment for the construction of the line and completes final design of the structures. Construction of the line starts with clearing and soil investigation. Structures are erected and the conductors are installed. Cleanup concludes the process. Constructing and energizing the transmission line usually takes between six and 24 months.

³⁰⁰ PUC Subst. R. §25.101(c)(6)(B).

APPENDIX I : TBPC'S PROPOSED STATUTORY CHANGES

At the committee's request, the Texas Building and Procurement Commission (TBPC) submitted this list of proposed changes to its governing statute and other relevant state laws.³⁰¹ This presentation of this list does not constitute a legislative recommendation by the committee.

Commission Authority

Delete the statutory requirement which states the Commission shall have three deputy directors. (§2152.104)

Clarify the term "Commission" to mean the executive director or staff, and add the term "Board" to mean the Commissioners. (Chapter 2152)

Allow the Executive Director to serve as the agency's representative unless the Executive Director or the Chairman deem otherwise. (Chapter 2152)

Transfer responsibility for the Child Care Development Board to the Texas Workforce Commission as contemplated by Senate Bill 1496, 77th Legislature.

Construction and Leasing

Delete the statutory requirement which states the director of the Facilities Construction and Space Management Division (FCSM) shall be a registered architect or professional engineer. (§2152.104)

Add a requirement that state agencies seek approval from the Legislative Budget Board when requesting changes in project plans after construction projects exceed 100 percent of their authorized costs. (Chapter 2166)

Require state agencies to seek prior approval for building modifications under the TBPC's control, and provide TBPC with a copy of the plans or drawings showing those modifications to ensure compliance with §2165.054. (§2165.002)

Delete statutory requirement to maintain design files and notify design professionals of interviews. (§§ 2166.201 and 2166.203)

³⁰¹ Except as otherwise noted, all statutory references in this appendix refer to the Government Code.

Require non-exempt-using agencies to transfer legislative authorizations of appropriations to TBPC when TBPC is responsible for construction of the project. (§2166.251)

Delete the requirement to include the project budget in the Request For Proposal and the requirement to read aloud the proposed prices at the opening of the proposal. (§2166.2533)

Allow the FCSM director to have full voting rights during the review of the Uniform General Conditions. (§2166.305)

Eliminate statutory requirement to advertise lease solicitations through public notice in newspapers. (§2165.183)

Eliminate statutory requirement to seek comment from the General Land Office on public grounds and private leases. (§§ 2165.154 and 2165.204)

Eliminate statutory requirement to obtain approval from the Office of the Attorney General for public ground leases. (§2165.155)

Harmonize statutory requirements on TBPC's use of proceeds from public grounds and private leases. (§§ 2165.156 and 2165.211)

Clarify statutory requirements to give TBPC complete control of all parking facilities in the commission's inventory. (§2165.202)

Eliminate statutory restriction regarding the amount of private lease space. (§2165.205)

Amend statutory language to "may" from "shall" to allow TBPC the flexibility to determine the best course of action regarding recovery of costs for leasing services. (§2167.007)

Procurement

Overall, the state purchasing statutes need a thorough overall to clarify and consolidate state procurement requirements. Current statutory requirements occasionally drive decisions that are costly and not in the best interest of the state solely for the sake of compliance.

Combine multiple statutory definitions to provide consistent standards and criteria to guide the award of contracts providing the "best value" to the state. (§§ 2155.074 and 2157.003)

Amend the purchaser training and certification program requirements to parallel nationally recognized certification programs by extending purchaser recertification time frames and allowing flexibility in continuing education requirements. (§2155.078)

Clarify the definition of "resale" items which are exempt from TBPC's procurement authority. (§2155.141)

Provide TBPC the authority to collect a 1 percent rebate from vendors participating in the Multiple Award Contract Schedule Program. Currently, the 1 percent rebate is collected by the

federal government on its purchases and reflected in vendor pricing available on multiple award schedules. However, TBPC is unable to collect the rebate on purchases made by the State on the same contracts, because it lacks the statutory authority. (§2155.502)

Eliminate statutory requirements to advertise procurement solicitations through public notice in newspapers. Notification of the public and vendors is currently accomplished through a variety of electronic media, including agency web sites and the state's Electronic Marketplace. (§§ 2155.264, 2155.083, and 2156.002)

Transfer the responsibility for developing and periodically updating the contract management guide from the Office of the Attorney General to TBPC. (§2262.051)

Transfer the responsibility for developing a training program for contract managers from the State Auditor's Office to TBPC. (§2262.053)

Travel Services

Expand travel service contracts to allow local governmental entities to participate. (§2171.053)

Delete statutory requirements mandating the use of private travel agencies to provide travel services to state agencies. The flexibility to develop other options to provide travel services is needed to accommodate changes in the travel industry. (§2171.052)

Fleet Management

Require monthly reporting. (§2171.101)

Amend statutory language to "may" from "shall" to allow TBPC the flexibility to determine the best course of action regarding the provision of vehicle fleet maintenance services. (§2171.102)

Clarify the method of disposal for vehicles to indicate State Surplus Property Program is controlling. (§2171.104)

Other Programs

Amend statutory language to "may" from "shall" to allow TBPC the flexibility to determine the best course of action regarding the operation of a central supply store. (§§ 2172.001 and 2172.002)

Eliminate the statutory requirement to advertise surplus property sales in the newspaper. (§2175.189)

Amend statutory requirements to give TBPC the authority to determine the best method of disposal for state surplus property. (§2175.184)

Clarify contract modification and amendment procedure listed in §§ 2254.028 and 2254.029.
(§2254.031)

Remove Commission authority and designate the Texas Department of Public Safety as the
primary agency charged with school-bus safety standards. (Transportation Code §547.702)