



Madeline Parker <mjparker@burnetcountytexas.org>

Fwd: Computer purchase Requests - Technical Specifications Needed

Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>
To: Madeline Parker <mjparker@burnetcountytexas.org>

Fri, Jul 31, 2026 at 1:27 PM

Bryan Wilson
Burnet County Judge
220 S. Pierce
Burnet, TX 78611
512-756-5400



----- Forwarded message -----

From: <gharris@burnetcountytexas.org>
Date: Fri, Jul 31, 2026 at 1:19 PM
Subject: RE: Computer purchase Requests - Technical Specifications Needed
To: Kelley Glaeser <kglaeser@burnetcountytexas.org>
Cc: Chad Collier <ccollier@burnetcountytexas.org>, Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>, Ashley Edwards <aedwards@burnetcountytexas.org>

Kelley,

The CTO number listed on the equipment list represents the vendor-assigned identifier for a Configure-to-Order system. Unlike a standard SKU tied to a fixed configuration, this number corresponds to a custom build specification — including processor, memory, storage, graphics, networking, and OS/warranty selections — tailored to meet the county's specific requirements. It serves as the reference point linking the equipment list entry to the detailed technical specification provided by the vendor (CTO number functions as the vendor's reference/configuration number for Burnet County). That linked information has been provided as the technical specification.

Respectfully,

Gregory Harris

Director, Technology & Cybersecurity

Burnet County, Texas

GHarris@BurnetCountyTexas.org

(o) 512.715.5285

(c) 512.755.4522

From: Kelley Glaeser <kglaeser@burnetcountytexas.org>

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2026 8:27 AM

To: gharris@burnetcountytexas.org

Cc: Chad Collier <ccollier@burnetcountytexas.org>; Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>; Ashley Edwards <aedwards@burnetcountytexas.org>

Subject: Re: Computer purchase Requests - Technical Specifications Needed

Greg,

Thank you for your detailed explanation regarding the Department of Technology & Cybersecurity's standardization recommendations. I understand and appreciate the operational reasons for recommending standardized hardware and recognize that standardization can provide efficiencies in deployment, management, and support. However, I do not believe your response addresses the

procurement responsibilities assigned to the Purchasing Agent. The issue is not whether standardization is an appropriate IT strategy. Rather, the issue is ensuring that each procurement complies with the County's Purchasing Policy and applicable law.

As Purchasing Agent, I have an independent responsibility to verify that:

- the procurement method complies with County policy;
- the procurement file contains sufficient documentation to support the purchase;
- the purchase represents best value to the County; and
- all required approvals have been obtained.

Those responsibilities require review of procurement documentation and cannot be waived simply because the same specifications have been used previously. Your statement requesting that the "standardization position and specification package be treated as the established baseline going forward, rather than re-opened for review with each new request," would effectively eliminate the Purchasing Agent's ability to perform those required procurement responsibilities. I do not believe any department has the authority to exempt future purchases from procurement review absent action by Commissioners Court or a change in County policy.

Likewise, while DIR contracts provide a lawful purchasing vehicle, use of a DIR contract does not, by itself, eliminate the Purchasing Agent's responsibility to document compliance with County policy or determine that the procurement represents best value under the circumstances.

My objective is not to revisit or challenge the Department's technical recommendations. Rather, it is to ensure that the procurement process remains consistent with County policy and that the Purchasing Agent is able to fulfill the responsibilities assigned.

Again, I need the generic specifications for laptops and towers so that my office can independent verify and document

that the County has complied with Burnet County's Purchasing Policy, obtain competitive quotes from qualified DIR vendors, determine

lowest cost best value based on the approved specifications, from DIR vendors and present the supporting procurement documentation to Commissioner's Court for their consideration and selection, as we do for all applicable purchases.

Thanks

Kelley

On Thu, Jul 30, 2026 at 8:55 PM <gharris@burnetcountytexas.org> wrote:

Kelley,

The requested technical specifications and equipment recommendations (equipment list) have been provided. To ensure best value for the County, it is the Department of Technology & Cybersecurity's (DoTC) position that the County continue standardizing computer purchases on the currently specified equipment list, rather than developing new or varied specifications on a per-request basis.

This equipment is procured under the same standardized, competitively-awarded vendor contracts (Texas DIR) that state law requires Texas state agencies to use, and that Texas counties and school districts already rely on. Under Texas Government Code § 2157.068, state agencies are subject to defined bid-threshold requirements for IT commodity purchases made through DIR's Cooperative Contracts Program, and DIR's hardware offerings include branded contracts awarded for specific manufacturers (e.g., Dell, HP, Lenovo) following a competitive, state-level procurement process. This means the standardization reflected in our current equipment list is not an inference about what other counties "probably" do — it is built directly on the same statutory, pre-competed contract vehicle that governs IT procurement across Texas state and local government.

Beyond the legal and procurement basis, this approach reflects standard practice across enterprise IT environments generally, for the following reasons:

- Configuration/image management: A single gold image, driver set, and firmware/BIOS update path, rather than maintaining and testing multiple hardware variants.
- Patch and vulnerability management: Endpoint management tools (e.g., SCCM/Intune, Dell Command | Monitor, HP Wolf/TechPulse, Lenovo Commercial Vantage) function most effectively — and in some cases only fully function — within a single vendor ecosystem, including remote BIOS management, asset telemetry, and firmware attestation.
- Supply chain risk and provenance: Fewer OEM relationships to vet, and simpler chain-of-custody documentation to support TAA/BAA and NDAA Section 889 compliance.
- Warranty, RMA, and lifecycle management: A single depot/support contract, common parts pool, and uniform refresh cycle, reducing total cost of ownership and downtime.
- Interoperability with existing infrastructure: Docking stations, peripherals, imaging infrastructure, and helpdesk staff training remain cost-effective to maintain against one hardware line rather than several.
- Auditability: A homogeneous fleet with a single configuration baseline is significantly easier to demonstrate continuous FISMA/NIST 800-53 compliance for than a mixed-vendor environment.

This same standardization principle applies beyond end-user computers to the County's core network and security infrastructure — firewalls, switches, and related network equipment. DoTC manages this environment as a single, cohesive architecture, using centralized management platforms, unified policy enforcement, and

consistent firmware/patch baselines that depend on manufacturer consistency to function. Introducing multiple manufacturers into that environment does not simply add variety — it removes the Department's ability to centrally manage, monitor, patch, and secure the environment as intended. At that point, the original management objective and security strategy are no longer achievable, regardless of the quality of any individual product, because the tools and processes built to manage a single-vendor environment cannot be extended across incompatible platforms without significant added cost, staffing, and risk. The same logic that applies to firewalls and switches applies directly to end-user computers.

This recommendation is made in the County's interest, not in the interest of any manufacturer. DoTC's responsibility is to ensure that public funds are spent in a way that delivers the most secure, supportable, and cost-effective outcome for the County over the full equipment lifecycle — not simply the lowest unit price at time of purchase. Standardization under the DIR contract vehicle is the mechanism by which that best-value outcome, and continued regulatory compliance, is achieved and sustained.

I also want to note that this same rationale and these same specifications have already been communicated on numerous prior occasions — via multiple emails and in meetings with the County Auditor. Re-vetting this standardization decision and re-supplying the underlying specifications each time a new request comes in is creating a recurring bottleneck in the procurement process. To keep future requests moving efficiently, I'd ask that this standardization position and specification package be treated as the established baseline going forward, rather than re-opened for review with each new request.

Please note from my previous email concerning laptop back order: Given the current circumstances, I recommend that we provide the desktop listed on the equipment list as a temporary solution until the laptops become available. This will allow the user to have the necessary technology available while we wait for the laptops to be back in stock. Another consideration would be to carry the funds forward into the next fiscal year to accommodate the purchase when the laptops become available.

Commissioners are Bcc'd to avoid quorum

Respectfully,

Gregory Harris

Director, Technology & Cybersecurity

Burnet County, Texas

GHarris@BurnetCountyTexas.org

(o) 512.715.5285

(c) 512.755.4522

From: Chad Collier <ccollier@burnetcountytexas.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 11:42 AM

To: Kelley Glaeser <kglaeser@burnetcountytexas.org>

Cc: Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>; Ashley Edwards <aedwards@burnetcountytexas.org>; Greg

Harris <gharris@burnetcountytexas.org>

Subject: Re: Computer purchase Requests - Technical Specifications Needed

I thought it was that Microsoft surface. There was a sheet when we had our meeting. If desk top, Greg will have to get those specs

On Thu, Jul 30, 2026, 9:40 AM Kelley Glaeser <kglaeser@burnetcountytexas.org> wrote:

Chad,

I have received computer requests from multiple departments that have approval through Court to use FY26 funding for computers. At this time I am unable to proceed with the purchasing process because Purchasing has not yet received the technical specifications or approved equipment recommendations necessary to develop competitive specifications, obtain quotes, and ensure compliance with County Purchasing Policy and applicable purchasing laws.

Requests have been made over multiple e-mails for these specifications (see attached). The initial request was made in April, and the requested information has not yet been received.

As additional computer requests are submitted, I will be forwarding them to you and will respond to the requesting department heads and elected officials that Purchasing is waiting for the technical specifications necessary to begin the procurement process. Once the required specifications are received, Purchasing can proceed to obtain quotes and complete the procurement process. All questions regarding the equipment specifications, anticipated timeline, or other technical details should be directed to you."

Thanks,

Kelley

--

Thank you,

Kelley Glaeser

County Auditor

Burnet County

KGlaeser@burnetcountytexas.org

512-756-5495



All Commissioners were blind copied for informational purposes only. No response is requested or expected. Please do not reply all regarding this matter to avoid a walking quorum .

--

Thank you,

Kelley Glaeser

County Auditor

Burnet County

KGlaeser@burnetcountytexas.org

512-756-5495

