The Board of Directors of the Ark-Tex Council of Governments will meet at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, March 31, 2016, at The First Baptist Church of Clarksville, 1501 U.S. Highway 82 West, Clarksville, Texas, hosted by the Honorable Ann Rushing, Mayor, City of Clarksville. (See enclosed map.)

Item 1. Call to order.

Item 2. Invocation.


Item 4. Approve the minutes as submitted of the Ark-Tex Council of Governments Board of Directors Meeting held Thursday, December 10, 2015, in Hooks, Texas.

**Review and Comment**

*Items 5, 6 & 7 to be presented by staff member Paul Prange.*

Item 5. Review and comment on an Environmental Assessment to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for proposed Water Quality Permit Renewal by:

a) Queen City to authorize the discharge of treated wastewater from the facility located on the south side of Cypress Creek, Cass County, Texas, ultimately into the State of Arkansas.

Item 6. Review and comment on an Environmental Assessment to TCEQ for proposed Air Quality Permit Renewal by:

a) Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation to authorize the continued operation of a Rendering Plant located at 1000 South O’Tyson Street, Mt. Pleasant, Titus County, Texas.

b) Luminant Mining Company LLC to authorize continued operation of a lignite handling plant located on County Road 2309, near the intersection of FM 1870 and County Road 2309, Sulphur Springs, Hopkins County, Texas.

c) Luminant Generation Company LLC to authorize the continued operation of the fly ash and Unit 3 coal handling systems at the Monticello Steam Electric Station located eight miles southwest on FM 127 in Mt. Pleasant, Titus County, Texas.

Item 7. Review and comment on an Environmental Assessment to TCEQ for Draft Federal Operating Permit Renewal by:

a) Midcontinent Express Pipeline to authorize the operation of the Lamar Compressor Station, located near Highway 24 and FM 1184 in Paris, Lamar County, Texas.

b) West Fraser Inc. to authorize operation of the lumber mill located at 1345 US Highway 82 East, New Boston, Bowie County, Texas.

**Regular Business**

Item 8. Review and consider approval for TexAmericas Center membership to ATCOG. (See attachment 1) (To be presented by staff member Amber Thurston)
Item 9. Review and consider approval of the appointment of new members to the Area Agency on Aging Regional Advisory Council. (See attachment 2) (To be presented by staff member Diane McKinnon)

Item 10. Review and consider approval of submission of the following grant proposals to the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). (Handout to be provided at meeting) (To be presented by staff member Nancy Hoehn)

   a) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities for Atlanta District to launch Senior Meal Center Transportation.

   b) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities for Paris District to purchase two Fixed Route Buses and provide operating funds.

   **Other Business**

Item 11. Executive Director Report (For information only – See attachment 3) (To be presented by Executive Director Chris Brown)

   a) Update on Transportation Meetings

   b) Transportation Quarterly Monitoring

   c) Area Agency on Aging Committee Meeting Minutes

   **Announcements**

The next Executive Committee Meeting will be held Thursday, April 28, 2016, at 10:00 a.m., at the Titus County Extension Office, 1708 Industrial Road, Mt. Pleasant, Texas. There will be an RPO Committee meeting held at 9:00 a.m. in the same location.
The ATCOG Board of Directors Meeting will be held in the Fellowship Hall of the First Baptist Church.
The Board of Directors of the Ark-Tex Council of Governments (ATCOG) met at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, December 10, 2015, at Hooks City Hall, in Hooks, Texas, hosted by Honorable Marc Reiter, Councilman, City of Hooks.

Item 1. President L.D. Williamson, Judge, Red River County, called the meeting to order.

Item 2. James Carlow, Judge, Bowie County, gave the invocation.

Item 3. Each attendee introduced themselves at this time.

Item 4. The next order of business was to approve the minutes as submitted of the Ark-Tex Council of Governments Board of Directors meeting held Thursday, September 24, 2015, in Bogata, Texas. Judge Williamson noted one change – correcting Executive Committee to Board of Directors.

Motion to approve was made by Ann Rushing, Mayor, City of Clarksville, and seconded by Robert Newsom, Judge, Hopkins County. The minutes were approved, with noted changes.

**Review and Comment**

*Items 5, 6, & 7 were presented simultaneously.*

Item 5. Paul Prange, Environmental Resources Coordinator, presented for consideration Environmental Assessments to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for proposed Water Quality Permit Renewal by:

   a) Luminant Generation Company, LLC, to authorize the discharge of treated wastewater from the facility located on County Road 2309, near the intersection of Highway 11 and Interstate 30 in Hopkins County, Texas, to the Sulphur/South Sulphur River, Big Cypress Creek Below Lake Bob Sandlin and Lake Bob Sandlin and to give notice to potentially-affected landowners not previously identified.

   b) Load Trail, LLC to authorize the continued operation of the trailer manufacturing facility located at 220 Farm Road 2216, Sumner, Lamar County, Texas.

   c) The U.S. Department of the Army and Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant to authorize an intermittent, flow variable discharge of stormwater from the plant site located at U.S. Highway 82 West, Texarkana, Bowie County, Texas, ultimately to Wright Patman Lake.

   d) Petrus Adrianus Boekhorst to authorize the operation of an existing concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) located at 336 County Road 3368, Hopkins County, Texas

   e) The City of Winfield to authorize the discharge of treated wastewater from the facility located near Interstate 30 and County Road 1065, Titus County, Texas.

Motion to approve was made by Judge Carlow and seconded by Lynda Munkres, Judge, Morris County. The items were approved.

Item 6. Mr. Prange presented for consideration an Environmental Assessment to TCEQ for proposed Air Quality Permit Renewal by:

   a) Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, LLC to authorize operation of Compressor Station 802 located on County Road 24200 in Lamar County, Texas.
b) U. S. Department of the Army to authorize the continued operation of two paint booths located at 333 Panther Creek Drive, New Boston, Bowie County, Texas.

Motion to approve was made by Judge Newsom and seconded by Judge Carlow. The items were approved.

Item 7. Mr. Prange presented for consideration an Environmental Assessment to TCEQ by the City of Nash, who has applied for a new authorization number to discharge from the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4), located in Nash, Bowie County, Texas, to the drainage area of the Sulphur River Basin.

Motion to approve was made by Judge Carlow and seconded by Mayor Rushing. It was approved.

**Regular Business**

Item 8. Mr. Prange presented for consideration approval of membership changes on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

Motion to approve was made by Mayor Rushing and seconded by Becky Wilbanks, Judge, Cass County. It was approved. Mr. Prange explained the committee will award each county $3,000 for community-wide clean up events.


Motion to approve was made by Judge Munkres and seconded by Judge Carlow. It was approved.

**Other Business**

Item 10. Chris Brown, Executive Director presented for discussion the benefits of State and National Organization Memberships, such as the Texas Association for Regional Councils (TARC) and the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO). With TARC being focused on the State of Texas only, it’s a smaller organization providing a closer relationship with greater benefits. The Corporation for Texas Regionalism (CTR) is an association which provides insight and assistance on legislation benefitting and/or affecting our region.

Judge Munkres noted that TARC seems to have more information for our region versus any of the other organizations, due to them being a smaller organization and more focused on State issues. Judge Williamson also noted that TARC not only assists the COGs with program issues, they also help the Counties reach TML (Texas Municipal League) or TAC (Texas Association of Counties) with any needs that arise with those organizations.

This item was for information only, so no action was taken.

Item 11. Mr. Brown presented for consideration ratification of the contracts listed below:

- Renewal of Texas Community Development Block (TxCDBG) Technical Assistance contract.
- Renewal of Texas Department of Transportation (TXDoT) Project Grant Agreements.
  - Section 5304 Federal – Planning
  - Section 5311 Federal – Rural Public Transportation (RPT)
  - Section 5311 Federal – Rural Transportation Assistance Program (RTAP)
  - Section 5316 Federal – Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) – has now ended.
  - Section 5339 Federal – Bus and Bus Facilities Program
- Amendments to Project Grant Agreements between ATCOG and TXDoT.
  - Public Transportation – State Funds
  - Section 5311 Federal – Rural Public Transportation (RPT)

Mr. Brown explained the Project Grant Agreements between ATCOG and TXDoT include the Transportation Department assisting Grayson/Fannin Counties with their rural transportation routes for approximately three months.
Motion to approve was made by Brady Fisher, Northeast Texas Resource Conservation and Development, and seconded by Judge Newsom. It was approved.

**Announcements**

Item 12. Judge Williamson announced the next Executive Committee meeting will be held Thursday, January 28, 2016 at the Titus County Extension Office, 1708 Industrial Road, Mt. Pleasant, Texas. Amber Thurston, Executive Assistant, explained due to scheduling conflicts, both the January and February meetings would be held at the new location, with plans to have the remainder of the meetings at the Luminant Community Room, as scheduled. She also extended thanks to Councilman Reiter for hosting the meeting today.

At this time, there was no further business, so Judge Williamson adjourned the meeting.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**
- L.D. Williamson, Judge, Red River County
- Becky Wilbanks, Judge, Cass County
- Brian Lee, Judge, Titus County
- Robert Newsom, Judge, Hopkins County
- Lynda Munkres, Judge, Morris County
- James Carlow, Judge, Bowie County
- Ann Rushing, Mayor, City of Clarksville
- Bob Thorne, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Daingerfield
- Emily Glass, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Sulphur Springs
- Marc Reiter, Councilman, City of Hooks
- A.M. "Rip" Benefield, Councilman, Queen City
- Brady Fisher, Northeast Texas Resource Conservation & Development Area, Inc.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**
- Daniel Alders, Office of Senator Ted Cruz
- Dennis Chartier, Mayor, City of Naples

**GUESTS PRESENT**
- Clarence Burns, Mayor, City of Linden
- Bob Swisher, City of Linden
- Robert McGee, Queen City Police Dept.
- Doug Bowers, City of Nash
- Darrin Lafayette, City of Nash
- Susan Thorne, Member of the Public

**STAFF PRESENT**
- Chris Brown, Executive Director
- Sharon Pipes, Director of Administration
- Paul Prange, Environmental Resources Coordinator
- Patricia Haley, Criminal Justice Coordinator
- Leslie McBride, Human Resources Coordinator
- Noah Gilliam, Homeland Security Specialist
- Amber Thurston, Executive Assistant

__________________________________
L.D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:

__________________________________
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**ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**  
**APPLICATION / PROJECT STAFF REVIEW FOR**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project SAI No: TX-R-20160303-0001-05</th>
<th>Date Received: 3-3-16</th>
<th>Staff Assignment: Paul Prange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant:** Queen City, Cass County, Texas

**Project Description:** Queen City has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to renew Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Permit No. WQ0011225001 to authorize the discharge of treated wastewater at a volume not to exceed a daily average flow of 250,000 gallons per day. The facility is located on the south side of Cypress Creek in Cass County, Texas. The discharge route is from the plant site to Cypress Creek; thence to Cypress Slough; thence into the State of Arkansas.

**PROJECT/EA REVIEW:**

- **Area to be served:** Queen City, Cass County, Texas.

- **Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances?** Yes. The TCEQ executive director has determined that the application is administratively complete and will conduct a technical review of the application.

- **Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels?** Yes. This permit application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

- **Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality?** Yes, coordination is in progress.

- **Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment?** There is a clearly defined need for the renewal of this TPDES Permit to allow the continued operation of the domestic wastewater treatment facility. This facility serves approximately 1,600 residents within Queen City. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed, thus minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

- **Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment?** No. The renewal of this permit will not authorize an increase in the number gallons of treated wastewater that can be discharged into the environment. This facility was constructed approximately 3 ½ years ago and is in excellent operational condition.

- **Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment?** Yes. The renewal of this permit will allow the continued operation of this facility, which directly serves the needs of all citizens located within Queen City. The disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the accomplishments.

**STAFF ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:** The permit renewal will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

**RECOMMENDED COMMENT:** Staff recommends support of this permit renewal application by Queen City, Texas.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND
COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED RENEWAL OF TEXAS POLLUTANT DISCHARGE
ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT NO. WQ0011225001, BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (TCEQ), FOR QUEEN CITY, CASS COUNTY, TEXAS TO
AUTHORIZE THE DISCHARGE OF TREATED WASTEWATER AT A VOLUME NOT TO EXCEED
A DAILY AVERAGE FLOW OF 250,000 GALLONS PER DAY. THE FACILITY IS LOCATED ON
THE SOUTH SIDE OF CYPRESS CREEK IN CASS COUNTY, TEXAS. THE DISCHARGE ROUTE
IS FROM THE PLANT SITE TO CYPRESS CREEK; THENCE TO CYPRESS SLOUGH; THENCE
INTO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of
1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of
Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by
the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the
Region, and any environmental impacts resulting therefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized
Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an
environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors
and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued
development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
## Project SAI No: TX-R-20160301-0002-05

### Applicant: Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation

### Project Description:

Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for renewal of Air Quality Permit Number 2031, which would authorize continued operation of a Rendering Plant located at 1000 South O’Tyson Street, Mount Pleasant, Titus County, Texas. The existing facility and/or related facilities are authorized to emit the following air contaminants: organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and particulate matter with diameters of 10 microns or less and 2.5 microns or less.

### PROJECT/EA REVIEW:

#### Area to be served: Titus County, Texas.

#### Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances? Yes. The TCEQ executive director has determined that the application is administratively complete and will conduct a technical review of the application.

#### Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels? Yes. This permit application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

#### Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality? Yes, coordination is in progress.

#### Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment? There is a clearly defined need for the renewal of this Air Quality Permit to allow the continued operation of the facility. This facility provides much needed employment to numerous residents of Titus County, Texas. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed, thus minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

#### Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment? No. The renewal of this permit will not authorize an increase in the amount of emissions, nor will it allow for any new construction onsite.

#### Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment? Yes. The renewal of this permit will allow the continued operation of this facility, which produces food that is consumed throughout the region. Furthermore, this facility is essential to the economy of Northeast Texas. The disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the accomplishments.

### STAFF ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

The permit renewal will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

### RECOMMENDED COMMENT:

Staff recommends support of this Air Quality Permit renewal application by Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED RENEWAL OF AIR QUALITY PERMIT NUMBER 2031, BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (TCEQ), FOR PILGRIM’S PRIDE CORPORATION IN TITUS COUNTY, TEXAS TO AUTHORIZ CONTINUED OPERATION OF A RENDERING PLANT LOCATED AT 1000 SOUTH O’TYSON STREET, MOUNT PLEASANT, TITUS COUNTY, TEXAS 75686. THE EXISTING FACILITY AND / OR RELATED FACILITIES ARE AUTHORIZED TO EMIT THE FOLLOWING AIR CONTAMINANTS: ORGANIC COMPOUNDS, NITROGEN OXIDES, CARBON MONOXIDE, SULFUR DIOXIDE AND PARTICULATE MATTER WITH DIAMETERS OF 10 MICRONS OR LESS AND 2.5 MICRONS OR LESS.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the Region, and any environmental impacts resulting wherefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:
## Project SAI No: TX-R-20160301-0003-05

### Applicant: Luminant Mining Company LLC.

### Project Description: Luminant Mining Company LLC has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to renew Air Quality Permit No. 4002, which would authorize continued operation of a lignite handling plant located on CR 2309, two miles from the intersection of FM 1870 and CR 2309 in Sulphur Springs, Hopkins County, Texas. The existing facility is authorized to emit the following air contaminants: particulate matter with diameters of 10 microns or less and 2.5 microns or less.

### PROJECT/EA REVIEW:

**Area to be served:** The City of Sulphur Springs, Hopkins County, Texas.

- **Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances?** Yes. The TCEQ executive director has determined that the application is administratively complete and will conduct a technical review of the application.

- **Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels?** Yes. This permit application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

- **Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality?** Yes, coordination is in progress.

- **Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment?** There is a clearly defined need for the renewal of this Air Quality Permit to allow continued operation of this facility which handles coal necessary for the production of electrical power and provides employment to numerous citizens living within our region. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed, thus minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

- **Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment?** No. This plant has been in operation since the early 1970s. The renewal of this permit will not authorize any increase in emissions and this facility is in excellent operational condition.

- **Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment?** Yes. The renewal of this permit will allow the continued operation of this facility, which directly serves the needs of the citizens living within the area. The disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the accomplishments.

### STAFF ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: The permit renewal will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

### RECOMMENDED COMMENT: Staff recommends support of this permit renewal application by Luminant Mining Company LLC.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE RENEWAL OF AIR QUALITY PERMIT NO. 4002 FOR LUMINANT MINING COMPANY LLC, BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (TCEQ) TO AUTHORIZE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE LIGNITE HANDLING PLANT ON CR 2309, TWO MILES FROM THE INTERSECTION OF FM 1870 AND CR 2309 IN SULPHUR SPRINGS, HOPKINS COUNTY, TEXAS.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the Region, and any environmental impacts resulting therefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

____________________________________
L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:

______________________________
# Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project SAI No:</th>
<th>TX-R-20160315-0003-05</th>
<th>Date Received:</th>
<th>03-14-16</th>
<th>Staff Assignment:</th>
<th>Paul Prange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant:** Luminant Generation Company LLC.

**Project Description:** Luminant Generation Company LLC has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to renew Air Quality Permit No. 2399, which would authorize continued operation of the fly ash and Unit 3 coal handling systems at the Monticello Steam Electric Station located 8 miles southwest of Mount Pleasant on FM 127, Mount Pleasant, Titus County, Texas. The existing facility is authorized to emit the following air contaminants: particulate matter with diameters of 10 microns or less and 2.5 microns or less.

## Project/EA Review:

**Area to be served:** The City of Mount Pleasant, Titus County, Texas.

**Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances?** Yes. The TCEQ executive director has determined that the application is administratively complete and will conduct a technical review of the application.

**Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels?** Yes. This permit application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

**Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality?** Yes, coordination is in progress.

**Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment?** There is a clearly defined need for the renewal of this Air Quality Permit to allow continued operation of this facility which produces electrical power and provides employment to numerous citizens living within our region. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed, thus minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

**Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment?** No. This plant has been in operation since the early 1970s. The renewal of this permit will not authorize any increase in emissions and this facility is in excellent operational condition.

**Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment?** Yes. The renewal of this permit will allow the continued operation of this facility, which directly serves the needs of the citizens living within the area. The disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the accomplishments.

## Staff Assessment of Environmental Impact:

The permit renewal will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

**Recommended Comment:** Staff recommends support of this air quality permit renewal application by Luminant Generation Company LLC.
RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE RENEWAL OF AIR QUALITY PERMIT NO. 2399 FOR LUMINANT GENERATION COMPANY LLC, BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (TCEQ) TO AUTHORIZE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE FLY ASH AND UNIT 3 COAL HANDLING SYSTEMS AT THE MONTICELLO STEAM ELECTRIC STATION LOCATED 8 MILES SOUTHWEST OF MOUNT PLEASANT ON FM 127, MOUNT PLEASANT, TITUS COUNTY, TEXAS.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the Region, and any environmental impacts resulting therefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:
Project SAI No: TX-R-201603108-0001-05  Date Received: 3-10-16  Staff Assignment: Paul Prange

Applicant: Midcontinent Express Pipeline LLC

Project Description: Midcontinent Express Pipeline has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality for a renewal of Federal Operating Permit No. 03274, to authorize operation of the Lamar Compressor Station, a Natural Gas Transmission facility. The area addressed by the application is located approximately 10 miles south of Paris, TX on Hwy 24, 1 mile south of the intersection at FM 1184 in Paris, Lamar County, Texas. The purpose of this permit is to improve overall compliance with the rules governing air pollution control by clearly listing all applicable requirements.

PROJECT/EA REVIEW:

Area to be served: Paris, Lamar County, Texas.

Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances? Yes. The TCEQ executive director has determined that the application is administratively complete, and has completed a technical review of the application. The executive director has recommend issuance of this permit.

Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels? Yes. This permit application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality? Yes, coordination is in progress.

Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment? There is a clearly defined need for the operation of this compressor station. The pipeline is necessary in order to transport compressed natural gas throughout our region. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed, thus minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment? No. This permit will not authorize any new construction.

Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment? Yes. This permit will allow the transportation of a valuable energy source. The disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the benefits provided.

STAFF ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: The permit will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

RECOMMENDED COMMENT: Staff recommends support of this Federal Operating Permit renewal by Midcontinent Express Pipeline LLC.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE RENEWAL OF FEDERAL OPERATING PERMIT NO. 03274 FOR MIDCONTINENT EXPRESS PIPELINE BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TO AUTHORIZE OPERATION OF ITS LAMAR COMPRESSOR STATION LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 10 MILES SOUTH OF PARIS, TX ON HWY 24, 1 MILE SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION AT FM 1184 IN PARIS, LAMAR COUNTY, TEXAS. THE PURPOSE IS TO IMPROVE OVERALL COMPLIANCE WITH THE RULES GOVERNING AIR POLLUTION CONTROL.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the Region, and any environmental impacts resulting wherefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:
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**Application / Project Staff Review for Environmental Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project SAI No: TX-R-20160301-0001-05</th>
<th>Date Received: 2-19-16</th>
<th>Staff Assignment: Paul Prange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant:** West Fraser, Inc.

**Project Description:** West Fraser, Inc. has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality for renewal of Federal Operating Permit No. 01585, to authorize operation of the lumber mill located at 1345 US Highway 82 East, New Boston, Bowie County, Texas. The purpose of a federal operating permit is to improve overall compliance with the rules governing air pollution control by clearly listing all applicable requirements.

**PROJECT/EA REVIEW:**

**Area to be served:** New Boston, Bowie County, Texas.

**Does the project comply or furnish reasonable assurances of compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances?** Yes. The TCEQ executive director has completed the technical review of the application, has made a preliminary decision to prepare a draft permit, and recommends issuance of the draft permit.

**Is the project consistent with state, area wide, and/or local planning or does it contribute toward goals or objectives identified at one or more of governmental levels?** Yes. This permit renewal application meets all statutory and regulatory requirements.

**Has this project been coordinated through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality?** Yes, coordination is in progress.

**Does the project address a clearly defined need and does the project take into account preservation of the environment?** There is a clearly defined need for the continued operation of the mill. The facility employs approximately 170 citizens who live within our region and provides valuable wood products to consumers throughout the nation. This facility has been in operation since 1980 and was purchased over 8 years ago by West Fraser, Inc. All guidelines required by TCEQ to protect the environment are being followed and minimal disruption of the environment is expected.

**Is the project likely to produce any significant adverse effects on the environment?** No. The TCEQ has determined that the emissions of air contaminants from this facility will not violate any state or federal air quality regulations and will have no significant adverse impact on soils, vegetation, or visibility. The permit will not authorize new construction.

**Do the anticipated accomplishments of the project justify the disruption to the environment?** Yes. This plant is currently permitted to produce 275 million board-feet of lumber per year and the “best available control technology” will be used to reduce air contaminants. Any particulate matter generated is trapped by wet scrubbers located within the facility and the disruption of the environment is minimal compared to the benefits provided.

**STAFF ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:** The permit renewal will not create any significant detrimental impact to the environment, as determined by TCEQ.

**RECOMMENDED COMMENT:** Staff recommends support of the Federal Operating Permit renewal by West Fraser Inc.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS WITH REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE RENEWAL OF FEDERAL OPERATING PERMIT NO. 01585, FOR WEST FRASER, INC., BY THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TO AUTHORIZE THE OPERATION OF A SAWMILL AND PLANING MILL FACILITY LOCATED AT 1345 US HIGHWAY 82 EAST IN NEW BOSTON, BOWIE COUNTY, TEXAS.

WHEREAS, under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, the Ark-Tex Council of Governments has been designated as the area wide agency to review certain projects; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that certain development plans be reviewed by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments for their consistency with the overall development of the Region, and any environmental impacts resulting wherefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS:

Section 1 - That the Board of Directors recognizes the Executive Director as the Authorized Official, and he has been given the power to comment upon projects having an environmental impact. This application has been reviewed by the Board of Directors and can reasonably be approved.

Section 2 - That the above-mentioned permit is desirable and needed for continued development in the Region.

REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 2016

L. D. Williamson, President
Ark-Tex Council of Governments

ATTEST:

_________________________________________
RESOLUTION NO. 20160223-05

A RESOLUTION TO APPLY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN ARK-TEX COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS AND DESIGNATE A DIRECTOR TO ACT ON BEHALF OF TexAMERICAS CENTER

WHEREAS, TexAmericas Center is a political subdivision of the State of Texas with the powers and authorities specified in Chapter 3503 of the Special District Local Laws Code of the State of Texas; and

WHEREAS, Ark-Tex Council of Governments is a voluntary organization of local cities, counties, school and special districts authorized pursuant to statutes of the State of Texas and the State of Arkansas for the purpose of dealing with problems and planning needs that require regional attention; and

WHEREAS, Ark-Tex Council of Governments is comprised of 10 counties, 40 cities, 14 school districts and 13 special purpose districts serving a population of approximately 325,000 persons living in Northeast Texas and Miller County, Arkansas; and

WHEREAS, Ark-Tex Council of Governments is involved in economic development, grant writing and administration, and other matters important to the growth and welfare of its members; and

WHEREAS, TexAmericas Center desires to participate as a member of Ark-Tex Council of Governments in the regional economic development and to use the services of Ark-Tex Council of Governments for economic development, regional planning and grant writing and administration;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that TexAmericas Center apply for membership in Ark-Tex Council of Governments and upon its acceptance as a member pay the required annual fees as may be necessary to participate as a member; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that upon acceptance of TexAmericas Center as a member of the Ark-Tex Council of Governments, William Scott Norton shall be and he is hereby appointed to serve as the Director representing TexAmericas Center.

PASSED and APPROVED this 23rd day of February, 2016.

Gabe Tarr, Vice-Chairman of the Board

ATTEST:

Boyd Sartin, Secretary/Treasurer
**ITEM 9:**

Review and consider approval of the appointment of new members to the Area Agency on Aging Regional Advisory Council.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Area Agency on Aging is seeking approval by the Ark-Tex Council of Governments' Board for the appointment of a new member to fill the vacancy in the required Elected Official category and the required Franklin County representative category.

**DISCUSSION:**

The appointee for the vacant Elected Official position is Judge L.D. Williamson. He has resided in Red River County for 40 years, having served as Mayor of the City of Clarksville for 6 years and then as Red River County Judge for 14 ½ years. As an elected official, Judge Williamson was a member of the ATCOG Executive Committee and served as President of the Board for 5 years. In October 2000, he resigned as County Judge and President of the Board to take the position of Executive Director of ATCOG, a position he held until his retirement in January 2014. Retirement didn’t last long as he once again ran for and was elected as the Red River county Judge, and he currently holds that office. In addition to his service to ATCOG, Judge Williamson has been extremely involved in civic activities in Red River County. He is now an active member of the Kiwanis Club and a Deacon at First Baptist Church in Clarksville.

The appointee for the vacant Council position is Dorothy Young, who was recommended for appointment by Judge Scott Lee. She and her husband owned their own business for 18 years. After selling the family business, Dorothy worked for Jordan Health Services for 5 ½ years. She is very involved in the community volunteering weekly for the Franklin County Food Bank, Treasurer for the Board of the Food Bank, church clerk and a part of the ladies ministry team. She is eager to serve on this committee.

Judge Williamson was approved by the Regional Advisory Council at its meeting December 4, 2015. Mrs. Young was approved by the RAC on March 3, 2016. We are now requesting approval of the ATCOG Board.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of these appointees.
Quarterly/Financial Monitoring Form

The Texas Administrative Code §31.48 requires TxDOT to conduct quarterly on-site financial reviews that support requests for payment, and discuss with the sub-recipient; problems encountered, technical assistance needs, and other topics related to the provision of public transportation.

Form is applicable to transit agencies with an active grant agreement. Financial monitoring (Part B or C of the form) is required for agencies with a billing processed during the quarter. Part D is required for Davis Bacon monitoring.

**AGENCY INFORMATION**

| Transit Agency: Ark-Tex Council of Governments | Payee ID Number: 17512933833000 |
| Date: 03/11/16 | FY: 16 | ☑ 1st Qtr. Sep-Nov | ☑ 2nd Qtr Dec-Feb | ☐ 3rd Qtr Mar-May | ☐ 4th Qtr Jun-Aug |

**PART A: AGENCY CONSULTATION**

1) List the names and positions of agency staff participating in the quarterly monitoring:

Tammy Jones, Accounting Specialist

2) Has there been a change in the agency accounting system, accounting or key personnel, or agency service delivery model? ☑ Yes ☒ No

3) For each active PO, please summarize the overall project status. (For example, document any project delays, expenditure or RFR delays, current or future procurements, DBE status, or any problems encountered.)

- PO#7305 - no issues
- PO#7772 - no issues
- PO#7415 - no issues
- PO#5290 - no issues
- PO#8868 - no issues
- PO#7604 - working to get fixed route system in Paris going - will then identify where bus stops and passenger shelters will need to be located. Obtaining environmental clearance will then begin.
- PO#7749 - back on track
- PO#8868 - no issues
- PO#8427 - no issues
- PO#8382 - no issues

4) What is the status of the agency's most recent A-133 single audit? (For example: Is an A-133 single audit required? If so, will the audit be submitted no later than 9 months after the agency's fiscal year end? Did the submitted audit reveal findings relevant to public transportation?) ☐ N/A: A-133 single audit not required.

FY15 - A-133 estimated completion date is June 30, 2016

5) List any areas where technical assistance is needed:

During this quarter technical assistance was given regarding vehicle disposition; drug and alcohol regulations;

6) Was a Request for Reimbursement processed during the quarter? ☑ Yes ☐ No

7) Did the agency have any federally funded repair, construction, or rehab projects with a contractor/vendor that were over $2,000? (Ex: painting, door repair, roofing) ☑ Yes ☒ No If yes, then Davis Bacon may be applicable.

*PTC and transit agency signature required upon completion of the form.

Sonya Hudson
PTC Name
PTC Signature
03/11/16
Date

Tammy Jones
Transit Representative Name
Transit Representative Signature
03/11/16
Date
Part B. Reviewing Financial Records

Procedure:
- At least 30% of total amount reimbursed to the sub-recipient must be reviewed and documented for the quarter.
- Minimum of 30%, but not more than 3, POs billed in the quarter must be selected for review. (At least 1 billing will be reviewed from each PO selected.)
- Billings selected for review will have each budget category billed reviewed (Admin, Operating, and Capital); (At least 1 line item per budget category billed must be examined.)

1) What support did the agency submit with RFRs?
- General ledger report (Streamlined approach)
- Full documentation (Detailed source documentation: invoices, canceled checks, check registers, etc)
  - Retain documents and document 30% of review

2) In the table below enter the requested information for this quarter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amt Paid to agency this quarter:</th>
<th>Total Number of POs with a billing this quarter:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 558,707.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount to review (Total Amount Paid x 30%): $ 167,612.17
Total POs to review (Total POs x 30%): 2.1 (up to 3 POs)

POs and Billings Selected for Review:
Procedure: Use the table below to list the PO, Billing Number, and the Billing Amount for billings that have been selected for review during the quarterly monitoring process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Project No.:</th>
<th>PO No.:</th>
<th>Billing No.:</th>
<th>Billing Amt:</th>
<th>Planning: Check if FLN or REG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>7415</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27,756.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>7415</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18,535.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>7305</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47,767.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>5290</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104,095.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Results of Quarterly Review:
Procedure: Complete the review and document results in the space below.

1) Specify areas of non-compliance documented during the Quarterly Financial Monitoring:

None

2) Was an IAP issued as a result of this review?
- Yes [x] No (If Yes, please attach the IAP)
Sample Number: 1
Project No.: ICB1601  PO No.: 7415  Billing No.: 3  Billing Total: $ 27756.9

Do the percentages for federal expenses and match amount agree with the PO budget?  □ Yes  □ No
Expense categories included within RFR:  □ Administration  □ Operating  □ Capital

Procedure: Review receipts, cancelled checks, expense invoices, and other source documentation to verify costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING</th>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Operating Line Items Reviewed $: 27,756.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>$: 27,756.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the items reviewed, answer questions A through G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES / NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Total dollar amount reviewed for this sample: (Admin + Operating + Capital) $ 27,756.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Are costs allowed, reasonable, and charged to the appropriate program?  □ No  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Were purchases properly authorized?  □ N/A  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Were costs incurred during the contract period?  □ No  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Do copies of receipts, cancelled checks, and paid invoices etc. support expenditures?  □ No  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>When state funds are used for match, does the RFR on the state contract(s) correspond with the match reported on the federal contract(s)?  □ N/A  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>When other than state funds are used for match (i.e. local match, contract revenue, in-kind) do source documents support the amount of match reported?  □ N/A  □ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s) of match: In-kind from Greyhound

In the space below, please provide an explanation for each “No” response. The explanation should list the category (Admin, Operating, Capital) line item affected and the specific issue(s) resulting in the selection of “No”. (Example: Admin, Line item 1, question b -- marked No because the cost was not reasonable. Document why the cost was not reasonable in the space provided below.)

If noncompliant, attach an Improvement Action Plan (IAP).
**Sample Number:** 2  
**Project No.:** ICB1601  
**PO No.:** 7415  
**Billing No.:** 5  
**Billing Total:** $18,535.76

Do the percentages for federal expenses and match amount agree with the PO budget?  
☒ Yes ☐ No

Expense categories included within RFR:  
☐ Administration  ☒ Operating  ☐ Capital

Procedure: Review receipts, cancelled checks, expense invoices, and other source documentation to verify costs.

### OPERATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Operating Line Items Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>$18,535.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the items reviewed, answer questions A through G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES / NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Total dollar amount reviewed for this sample: (Admin + Operating + Capital)</td>
<td>$18,543.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are costs allowed, reasonable, and charged to the appropriate program?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Were purchases properly authorized?</td>
<td>☒ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Were costs incurred during the contract period?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do copies of receipts, cancelled checks, and paid invoices etc. support expenditures?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) When state funds are used for match, does the RFR on the state contract(s) correspond with the match reported on the federal contract(s)?</td>
<td>☒ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) When other than state funds are used for match (i.e., local match, contract revenue, in-kind) do source documents support the amount of match reported?</td>
<td>☒ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s) of match:  

In the space below, please provide an explanation for each "No" response. The explanation should list the category (Admin, Operating, Capital) line item affected and the specific issue(s) resulting in the selection of "No". (Example: Admin, Line item 1, question b -- marked No because the cost was not reasonable. Document why the cost was not reasonable in the space provided below.)

If noncompliant, attach an Improvement Action Plan (IAP).
Sample Number: 3

Project No.: RUR1601  PO No.: 7305  Billing No.: 3  Billing Total: $47767.30

Do the percentages for federal expenses and match amount agree with the PO budget?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Expense categories included within RFR: ☑ Administration  ☑ Operating  ☐ Capital

Procedure: Review receipts, cancelled checks, expense invoices, and other source documentation to verify costs.

**ADMIN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Admin Line Items Reviewed $: 5,774.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>$: 5,774.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Operating Line Items Reviewed $: 41,992.78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>$: 41,992.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the items reviewed, answer questions A through G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES / NO</th>
<th>41,992.78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Total dollar amount reviewed for this sample: (Admin + Operating + Capital)</td>
<td>$47,767.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Are costs allowed, reasonable, and charged to the appropriate program?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Were purchases properly authorized?</td>
<td>☑ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Were costs incurred during the contract period?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Do copies of receipts, cancelled checks, and paid invoices etc. support expenditures?</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) When state funds are used for match, does the RFR on the state contract(s) correspond with the match reported on the federal contract(s)?</td>
<td>☑ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) When other than state funds are used for match (i.e. local match, contract revenue, in-kind) do source documents support the amount of match reported?</td>
<td>☑ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s) of match: Local</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide an explanation for each “No” response. The explanation should list the category (Admin, Operating, Capital) line item affected and the specific issue(s) resulting in the selection of “No”. *(Example: Admin, Line item 1, question b -- marked No because the cost was not reasonable. Document why the cost was not reasonable in the space provided below.)*

If noncompliant, attach an Improvement Action Plan (IAP).
Sample Number: 4  
Project No.: RPT1501  
PO No.: 5290  
Billing No.: 6  
Billing Total: $104,095.85  

Do the percentages for federal expenses and match amount agree with the PO budget?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  

Expense categories included within RFR:  
☒ Administration  ☒ Operating  ☒ Capital  

Procedure: Review receipts, cancelled checks, expense invoices, and other source documentation to verify costs.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMIN</th>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Admin Line Items Reviewed $:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALL $: 23,098.1 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING</th>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Operating Line Items Reviewed $:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALL $: 56,385.91 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>Line Item Description and Amount</th>
<th>Total of Capital Line Items Reviewed $:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALL - PM $: 24,611.84 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the items reviewed, answer questions A through G.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES / NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Total dollar amount reviewed for this sample: (Admin + Operating + Capital) $104,095.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are costs allowed, reasonable, and charged to the appropriate program? ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c) Were purchases properly authorized?  
☐ N/A | 
| d) Were costs incurred during the contract period? ✓ | 
| e) Do copies of receipts, cancelled checks, and paid invoices etc. support expenditures? ✓ | 
| f) When state funds are used for match, does the RFR on the state contract(s) correspond with the match reported on the federal contract(s)?  
☐ N/A | 
| g) When other than state funds are used for match (i.e. local match, contract revenue, in-kind) do source documents support the amount of match reported?  
☐ N/A | 

Source(s) of match: Local  

In the space below, please provide an explanation for each "No" response. The explanation should list the category (Admin, Operating, Capital) line item affected and the specific issue(s) resulting in the selection of "No". (Example: Admin, Line item 1, question b -- marked No because the cost was not reasonable. Document why the cost was not reasonable in the space provided below.)  

If noncompliant, attach an Improvement Action Plan (IAP).
MINUTES

The Ark-Tex Council of Governments (ATCOG) Area Agency on Aging (AAA) Regional Advisory Council met at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 3, 2016 at Titus Medical Plaza in Mount Pleasant, Texas. Bill Collins, Vice-Chairperson called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Jenny Butler, AAA Administrative Assistant, called roll. Regional Advisory Council members present were:

Linda Strickland, Morris County Representative
Grover Godfrey, Bowie County Representative
Betty Traylor, Healthcare Representative
Pat Dorrough, General Public Representative
Bill Collins, Title III Service Provider
Ken Kunkel, Veterans Administration
Rhonda Rogers, Texas Silver Haired Legislature
Paul Lindsey, Titus County Representative
L.M. Jester, Cass County Representative
Judge Lynda Munkres, Morris County Judge
Fred Lewis, Hopkins County Representative

It was determined that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
A motion was made by Pat Dorrough and seconded by Grover Godfrey to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2015 meeting.

Budget
Diane McKinnon passed out a memorandum received from the Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) that showed the FY16 budget for the AAA. Also distributed to the RAC members was a spreadsheet that reflected all the services provided by the AAA. Diane explained that Direct Services means that it’s a service provided by the AAA. Vendored Service means that the AAA contracts with an agency or individual that provides that service. The spreadsheet also showed that 50% of the budget costs goes to the meal programs, along with details on allocations for each service or program. Explanation was given on some services for members that needed clarification such as legal awareness and legal assistance which is provided through the AAA Benefits Counselor. Further detail was given regarding the Ombudsman program, and Ombudsman volunteers, which advocate for residents in long-term care facilities in the AAA region. Ombudsman volunteers must have 40 hours of training in order to be certified to perform duties. Diane also offered the AAA 800 phone number to members if they had any further questions in the future regarding the budget spreadsheet or programs.
**Appointing/Vote in of Franklin County Representative**
Diane McKinnon introduced Dorothy Young from Franklin County who had previously attended a RAC meeting and was interested in filling the vacancy for the Franklin County Representative. A motion was made by Ken Kunkel and seconded by L.M. Jester to accept Dorothy Young as the Franklin County Representative. All members present were in favor.

**HHSC – Health and Human Services Commission**
Diane McKinnon recently attended the quarterly meeting for TARC (Texas Association of Regional Councils) in Austin, TX. During the conference it was learned that several agencies will combine under HHSC effective September 1, 2016. The agencies to be combined are the AAA (Area Agency on Aging), DADS (Department of Aging and Disability Services), DARS (Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services), and DFPS (Department of Family and Protective Services). Specifics are unknown at this point but an oversight committee was required to provide an outline of how the new structure will work.

**Dental Grant**
The AAA will be working with CHRISTUS St. Michael Foundation and Genesis PrimeCare in Bowie County in implementing this new grant opportunity. The grant is for $20,000 and would be able to help with the dental needs of approximately 20 people with a maximum of $1500.00 per person. The hope is that the use and interest in this grant will help raise awareness of the unmet dental needs of seniors in the community. The information gathered with this grant will reflect the services provided while showing the impact that poor dental health affects overall emotional and physical health. Eligibility requirements for the program are the individual must be over the age of 60, live in Bowie or Cass County, have a monthly income less than $1505.00 for an individual or less than $2023.00 for a couple. They must provide proof of income and a form of identification. The AAA will be holding an eligibility screening on March 29, 2016 from 8:30-11:30am for those that are interested. After individuals are screened and considered eligible, Genesis PrimeCare will then do a more thorough screening on exact dental procedures and perform care based on individuals most in need.

**Older Americans Month**
Older Americans Month happens each year in the month of May. The AAA likes to go to Senior Centers in the region and play Bingo with other agencies in the area to express appreciation and to honor our older population. The AAA Ombudsman also participates with various activities at long-term care facilities. Betty Traylor, Pleasant Springs Healthcare Center, stated her facility plays community Bingo monthly. L.M. Jester, Cass County Representative, stated that he would like to participate in possibly offering goodie bags.

**Announcements**
Bill Collins stated that the Lamar County Human Resources annual Mardi Gras fundraising activity was very successful with a great turn out. They offer silent auction items and live auction items at the event. The Paris News reported $65,000 raised for their programs.
Diane McKinnon stated that the Daingerfield meal site has moved from downtown to the Fellowship Baptist Church located on Broadnax. Senior Citizens Services, a meal provider for the AAA, was approached by the church to provide the meals at this location.
Diane also stated that the free basic computer class for seniors had started again at the AAA every Tuesday and Thursday from 9:30-10:30am. Rhonda Rogers, TSHL member, stated that the meeting she attended in Abilene, TX at the Town Hall in early February was very informative and a great meeting. There will be a legislative session in Austin, TX April 4-8, 2016. Fred Lewis, Hopkins County Representative, stated that there will be a Health Fair on April 5th, 2016. Ken Kunkel, Veterans Administration, stated that his office saw 1300 veterans last year with a lot of veterans coming from the Mount Pleasant and Mount Vernon areas. His weekly group meeting for PTSD had 39 attendees last week and is the largest group of its kind in the Ark-La-Tex area. Dorothy Young from Franklin County gave information regarding the Pearly Gates Summer Camp for church groups. Senior Day is the third Thursday of every month, must RSVP to attend.

Adjourn
A motion was made by L.M. Jester and was seconded by Ken Kunkel to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Staff Present
Diane McKinnon, AAA Manager
Jenny Butler, AAA Administrative Assistant
Amanda Caery, AAA Program Assistant

Next RAC meeting is June 2, 2016.