

Public Comment – Agenda Item #8

Burnet County Commissioners Court – August 17, 2026

Judge Wilson and Commissioners:

The County already has a computer standard in use. Isn't it established and documented through purchase orders, vendor invoices, Commissioners Court minutes, and even through newer devices currently in use?

County Policy § 12.13 requires that technology equipment be pre-approved by the Technology Director for compatibility before it goes to the Court, and that all network computers meet minimum system requirements reviewed annually by the Technology Director.

Under Local Government Code Chapter 262, the Purchasing Agent controls the purchasing process—how items are competitively procured and paid for. That authority does not extend to rejecting technical specifications for security, configuration, or compatibility. Once competitive availability exists, especially through DIR, the Purchasing Agent's role is purely process and documentation. What is really going on here?

Yet the process has stalled. Have purchases already approved by this Court not been ordered? Unspent IT funds remain visible in public records. Now the Court is being asked to spend \$15,000 on an outside consultant to create standards while a subject-matter expert IT Director is already on staff. \$15,000 is real money that could otherwise go toward actual equipment.

Raising "antitrust" in this context does not reflect the law. A county setting internal technical standards for its own equipment is not an antitrust issue.

Before approving the \$15,000 consultant expenditure, the Court should determine whether the existing standard can be followed. The already-approved purchases should move forward under the standard that is already in use, recommended by the subject-matter expert IT Director already on staff.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Patty Cope,

Interested Person and Burnet County Taxpayer & Voter