



**DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**LEGISLATIVE MEETING**

**JUNE 23, 2010**

**10:00 A.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jeff Haste, Chairman  
Dominic D. DiFrancesco, II, Vice Chairman

George P. Hartwick, III, Secretary (ABSENT)

**STAFF PRESENT**

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Marie E. Rebuck, Controller; Janis Creason, Treasurer; Fred Lighty, Esq., Human Services Director's Office; J. Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Peter Vriens, Director of Human Services; Amy Richards, Commissioners' Office; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; Kay Lengle, Personnel; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Sandy Pintarch, Children & Youth; Charles McElwee, Commissioners' Office; David Onorato, Commissioners' Office; Terry Kaufman, Solicitor's Office; Danielle Vayda, Solicitor's Office; George Connor, Community & Economic Development; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Brenda Hoffer, Commissioners' Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Assistant Chief Clerk

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Pat Navagato, Randy Paul, Matt Tunnell, Bob Disabella, Chuck Rizzo, Bob Frankenfield and John Tierney

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m.

## **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the June 2, 2010 Workshop Meeting Minutes and the June 9, 2010 Legislative Meeting Minutes; motion carried.**

**It was moved by Ms. Rebeck and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the June 9, 2010 Salary Board Meeting Minutes; motion carried.**

**It was moved by Mr. Haste and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the June 2, 2010 Election Board Meeting Minutes; motion carried.**

## **EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners, we apparently had no executive sessions.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: We are at the point in time in the meeting for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board at this time?

Mr. Rizzo: My name is Charles J. Rizzo. I'm the President of Eastern Time, Inc. We are the apparent low bidder on the Dauphin County Prison Fire Alarm Replacement Project, which is listed as Item X.B. to reject the bids submitted for the Dauphin County Prison Fire Alarm System.

The point that we would like to make is that we feel that the advertisement for bids was Contract RPA0964 Modifications to Fire Alarm System at Dauphin County Prison for the Dauphin County Commissioners. It was public bid work. There were four pre-approved and prequalified bidders. We are listed as one of them. Two bidders bid it. Honeywell bid it at a cost of \$504,075. We bid it at a cost of \$247,870. Both bids had all the required documents signed. In the preliminary matters, we felt that Eastern Time had produced the lowest responsible bid. We felt that part of the discrepancy between the prices had to do with our ability to furnish and install in accordance with the written specifications, which we feel we are in compliance with. There is a statement in there under Section 16721, Part 1 in General Section 1.2 products not furnished or installed

but integrated with the work of this section. Item B of that was the Honeywell Management System, specifically Item B.1. Honeywell EBI System. So, therefore, that system was not met to be either furnished or installed, but simply integrated with. Systems integration by Wikipedia in Engineering is the bringing together of the component subsystems into one system and ensuring that the subsystems function together as a system. In information technology, systems integration is the process of linking together different computing systems and software applications, physical or functionally. The systems integrator, which is us, brings together discrete systems utilizing a variety of techniques such as computer networking, enterprise application integration, business process management or manual programming.

To that point, we feel we have accomplished the goals. There was a question that we had originally met and discussed the project and what we were providing on that project. There were certain elements that were thought us as proprietary functions with Honeywell that they were to furnish cost to any of the people, other than them, that had bid it, but refused to. We, therefore, looked at the project and bid it as we felt was responsible. We put together a budget that included utilizing the proper linking between their system and the system that we represent, the Edward Systems Technology System as manufactured by GE's security division. We discussed it with the main engineers, a man by the name of Bob Best, who is one of the engineers who developed that in conjunction. It was an integration piece that was developed by a gentleman named Bob Best of GE, directly with Honeywell, in a business relationship. We understand what is needed. We are fully qualified to do all the programming to bring you to that integration point. The next thing that came out was because of the evident discrepancy between the two systems' cost that, again, so where's that cost come from. We have a line diagram with us that's right from Honeywell that shows interconnection/interface, which we are providing interface. It is within our budget. We found prices that range from \$2,500 to \$5,000 for this piece, which placed it within our budget to provide. At this point, we are still questioning whether the rational thing to do with the taxpayers' money at stake here and a difference of better than a \$250,000 discrepancy between our bid and the bid from Honeywell, if we had not bid the job and the job were then awarded to Honeywell would provide an actual price on the project of \$504,075, the taxpayers would have paid over \$250,000 too much for the work. Now, the obvious question that we ask is we furnished a list of references in with our bid, signed and sealed by me, the President of the Company, stating that the other facilities have similar systems in size and magnitude and beyond the magnitude in some cases. Eastern Time is a 28 year old company, founded by myself. We have just about 30 employees right now. We are a Pennsylvania company. Every one of our people pays their taxes. I pay corporate tax. We have certifications on the equipment and in every department of Defense, Veterans Affairs, FAA, IRS, Department of General Services, and GSA. We are a URL listed company from start to finish. How we are then going to move forward with it or at least be given the opportunity to provide proof on our part that we can do what the specifications require. That's what we are here to discuss and put to you gentlemen. No disrespect to anyone in the process, but it is just that we feel that we are a key part in saving the taxpayers of Dauphin County and the State of Pennsylvania over \$250,000. At this point, it appears that the recommendation is to

throw out the bids and rebid it. We know that the bidding process, the redesign process and all that has costs associated with it. We invested time, effort and dollars into putting together what we felt was a responsible bid. It was the low bid of two bidders. We are respectfully requesting a cure period as opposed to an immediate determination to throw out the bids and redesign and re-solicit. That is basically the question that we have. This building has a system in it of the same manufacturer that we represent, EST, is an almost identical system to the system for over at the Prison that we are intending to put in. It would make sense to me, as a taxpayer from an efficiency standpoint, that similar systems are installed in several buildings as long as the qualifications of specifications and equipment are met. We're actually the same representative of the same manufacturer that has the existing system over at the Prison, which incidentally is not functioning right now, placing a liability risk on the County if anything were to happen right now.

Mr. Haste: I'm actually fairly informed on the process. I have oversight responsibility for the jail. I have been following this ever since ten minutes after the bids were opened. We have our engineer here, as well as our solicitor who have recommended that we rebid. The concern was and Randy Paul could correct me or the Solicitor's Office could, the concern was the intent of the bid was to have these two systems interconnected. The thought was if we were to proceed with this, which you are absolutely right, it saves us a lot of money. Honeywell would not be the way to go. The problem was were there other companies out there who could do a standalone system as well, who did not bid or did not put a package together, because in our initial bid it talked about them needing to be interconnected. The thought was is there another company out there that could do the same thing at a similar price or even a lower price that did not bid, because of the wording in the initial bid. The intent was to make it clear that the two systems had to be interconnected.

Mr. Rizzo: This is the direction that we are going.

Mr. Haste: It is my understanding it won't be truly interconnected.

Mr. Rizzo: That is not necessarily correct.

Mr. Haste: That is the concern that there are others out there. Randy Paul, will you come forward? Is that the issue?

Mr. Paul: Basically yes. My name is Randy Paul. I'm the consulting engineer on the project that developed the specs and drawings. The original intent and Dave Coldren of the county jail, wanted to have the new system integrated with Honeywell's energy building management system. We developed the specs and drawings for that purpose. Unbeknown to us at the time that Honeywell would be delinquent in furnishing a price to interconnect the controls and all the points for the other suppliers or manufacturers or installers of fire alarm systems. Unfortunately, they actually had some calls from other independent control fire alarm people that pulled out of the bid, because Honeywell was not quoting them a price to do the integrated controls. The bids did come in. Honeywell

had, of course, furnished the complete cost of interconnections at their cost. Eastern Time, of course, came in with their price. They had asked Honeywell for a price to interconnect. That quote was not given to them. Unfortunately, when the bids were received that clarification wasn't spelled out in Eastern Time's bid that the integration and set up of points were not included in their bid. We did go back to Honeywell to try to get a price directly after the bid was completed to see what that cost would be. It came in very high and costly to integrate them. Since then in talking with Dave Coldren, I had asked him if he would be satisfied to have actually independent systems, the fire alarm versus the building management and there would be no impact to the operation of the Prison. He stated that would be okay to him. My opinion was to basically rebid it and put it out on the streets for competitive bidding for independent fire alarm people to install.

Mr. Haste: In the new bid, the interconnectivity would not be necessary.

Mr. Paul: That would be correct.

Mr. Haste: That was my understanding.

Mr. Rizzo: I remember part of the bid requirement was visiting the job site and inspecting the conditions at the job site. Of the four companies that were listed and prequalified. You have to understand, we were one of the companies that were prequalified. We were the company that visited the job site. Two of the other ones that did not bid did not visit the job site. We visited the job site. We looked at all existing conditions. We read the specifications. We discussed it with the engineers at EST, who explained to us exactly how the integration is done. The only piece that they could not furnish us with was a piece called I believe an "EBI" which is a small module that basically bolts into our control panel and connects with the Port. At that point all of our program information, through the development of program integration software, directly between EST, the manufacturer and Honeywell, developed in conjunction between the two of them; we have the way to integrate the two systems. The system itself, the Honeywell EBI Building Management System is owned by the County. You own the system. The system integration itself, any of the programming, we have the piece that goes between the two systems and, again, number one remember first and foremost that the intent was this project was to replace a system that is defunct and not providing any protection for the personnel, whether they are residents or workers at the Prison right now. That was imperative. That was the number one priority here. Secondary priority in there is integrated into an existing EBI system, which there is information on. We read the specs. The information is given on what's there, the work stations and the type of computers that are there. Again, it states in there not to be furnished, but integrated with, which is again, what we intend to do. The programming of that since it is a building management system is universal programming, it is not something that is done specifically by Honeywell that you are held hostage with, because some of the other language in the specifications talk about training your people to be able to do this themselves. With that, we feel that we have sufficient running room in our bid to cover having our personnel attend a training program with Honeywell in the integration of that

piece in the programming of their equipment. With that in mind, again, the case that we are pleading is that a cure period be established to see if we can or cannot do it. I'm the President of the company. I'm the one that signs and seals all of our documents. I've never given a determination that we can't do it. Not verbally or in writing. I think that a cure period is the appropriate way to look at this. Not a cure period that brings in Honeywell to stand side-by-side with us, because they are obviously disgruntled, because they were twice our price and had we not bid they would mostly would have been awarded a project that would have cost the taxpayers over a quarter of a million dollars more. That is our case. We are a qualified company. I feel that it is the appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Haste: Randy Baratucci, how long do we have until we have to accept or reject this bid?

Mr. Baratucci: Our standard bid packages say 45 days. I don't know if Randy's bid package says something different. He would have to look.

Mr. Paul: 60 days.

Mr. Haste: How far into this process are we?

Mr. Paul: We have roughly a month yet.

Mr. Haste: Does that give you enough time?

Mr. Paul: Yes.

Mr. Rizzo: The point I'm trying to make is not trying to put anybody on the spot, but just saying that with the amount of disparity in cost, it would appear that the right thing to do with the taxpayers' money at stake here is to take a look at it and see if we can provide proof of being able to do it.

Mr. Haste: The other thing is to make sure, because this was a concern that was raised all along and I don't think there was anybody... I think a lot of folks were trying to find a way to do this, because of that savings. The thing is to make sure that we also meet the details of the specs of the bid so we aren't precluding someone else who could have bid.

Mr. Rizzo: I can only answer for my company. I can't answer for the other bidders.

Mr. Haste: The concern was, if in fact we don't truly interconnect and it is somewhat standalone, is there someone else that could have done that. That was the real concern.

Mr. Rizzo: The interface between the two, the integration between the two is what we intend to provide proof of.

Mr. Haste: What would be the problem...?

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners, the only thing in conferring over here obviously we are requiring some of the County Code and rather than having further debate on this probably the minimum would be to put it off one week until we figure out...

Mr. Haste: Do we have a meeting July 21?

Ms. Martz: No.

Mr. Haste: That is NACo. We would have to do it the week prior, which would be the 14<sup>th</sup> of July to meet the 24<sup>th</sup> deadline. Would that be sufficient time?

Mr. Rizzo: That is sufficient time.

Mr. Haste: Why don't we, at least right now, put this on hold until the 14<sup>th</sup>? If you can work something out in the meantime we can bring it back to the Board prior to it. Otherwise I would suggest that we have a drop dead date of the 14<sup>th</sup>, we either go thumbs up or thumbs down on the project. That buys us some time. I sort of had the impression that was part of what we did the past 25 days. Is there a problem with that?

Mr. Lighty: You are within your timeframe in which to take action on the bids that were submitted. The Solicitor's Office is of the opinion that you can do really one of two things at this point. You can use some of the balance of your time to determine if the bid was truly responsive. We do have the opinion here from Mr. Paul saying that it wasn't. If that is a genuine disagreement they have some days they can work that out. If that is not worked out you are within your legal rights to reject all bids and rebid.

Mr. Haste: July 14, at the latest that is our thumbs up or thumbs down. We will put this on hold until then to see if there is any way you can convince our engineer and solicitor that in fact it meets the specs.

Mr. Rizzo: Thank you!

Mr. Haste: July 14 is our drop dead date. We either rebid or accept it at that time.

Mr. Rizzo: I would just like to go on record saying that we understand your ability to reject any and all bids. We respect that.

Mr. Haste: My understanding was over the last, I can't say 30 days, because the bid was just opened 29 days ago, but shortly thereafter, it was my understanding that we have been trying to find a way to see if it met the specs and I think, as of this point, both the engineer and the solicitor's office felt that it did not or could be setting us up for other problems if there was another company that felt that they had been misinformed or they could have bid as well.

Mr. Rizzo: What happens, Mr. Haste, is that level of difficulty in doing something in many cases chases away competitors. It doesn't chase us away. We are a hardworking company. We finish every project that we start.

Mr. Haste: We want to make sure that whatever you do truly meets the requirements of the bid specs so that someone else can't say we could have done that too, but we didn't bid because of XYZ.

Mr. Saylor: We are going to put this back into Mr. Paul's hands and we will wait to hear back from him.

Mr. Haste: And Bruce Foreman. Everyone should get together and have a clear understanding. We want to save the taxpayers' money too. That also means that we want to make sure we don't set ourselves up for some litigation as well.

We are still under Public Participation, is there anyone else that would like to address the Board at this time? (There was none.)

### **DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS**

(There was none.)

### **SALARY BOARD**

A complete set of Salary Board Meeting Minutes are on file in the Commissioners' Office.

### **PERSONNEL**

Ms. Lengle: I do have an Addendum. Are there any questions on the items in the Addendum? I would like to Pull Item #5 from the Personnel Transactions Listing.

Mr. Haste: Item #5 will be held for now.

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the Personnel Packet, with Item #5 being held.**

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye and Mr. DiFrancesco – Aye; motion carried.

### **PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci: Since last week, we deleted an item from the Packet and added an item to the Packet. It all has to do with ammunition. We are having some issues with the State contract for ammunition. There was one on last week for Prison. It was over the \$10,000 amount. We had been buying those items off State contract, but we are having

some issues with trying to get those items off contract. That item was pulled until we can figure it out. It is not on the Packet anymore. In addition to that, Juvenile Probation needed some ammunition immediately for some training and qualifications and did ask to submit a requisition for a small amount of ammunition, \$3,000 worth, which has been added to Page 9. We will be purchasing that on the open market as an under \$4,000 purchase, because they do need it immediately. That has been added. All the budget items have been fixed.

Mr. Haste: I believe there was an article in the Patriot-News. For whatever reason coming off the State or Federal contracts, you cannot buy ammunition. But, on the open market there is enough ammunition out there. It is just at a higher price. I think it is because the ammunition that the government is buying up is being used for their purposes.

Mr. Baratucci: For some reason they changed the way they do things at the State. They used to have a multiple award for this. Each manufacturer was given a piece of it. Then they decided to just do a single award. So, now one company has it all and that has created some problems. We are probably going to have to go to the three quote open market thing. I think that is what the Prison is going to do. We might be paying a little more, but basically you need the product.

The other item that we discussed earlier and I just talked to them. Obviously if they can prove that we get the best of both worlds. We get the nice low price and we get the integration that we wanted originally. If they can prove it, it would save us some money. It does cost us a substantial amount of money to do a rebid. They are going to talk it over and work that out. This item will be put on hold as you indicated.

Mr. Haste: If you could just track that.

Mr. Baratucci: I'll get that on the calendar for a decision to be made one way or the other.

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the Purchase Order Packet.**

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye and Mr. DiFrancesco – Aye; motion carried.

## **REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR**

Mr. Yohe presented the following Report:

### **Report from the Office of Budget & Finance June 23, 2010**

- **June 11, 2010** transferred **\$1,535,359.45** to the **Payables** account from the County's Concentration account for checks issued that week. (Insurance payment and C&Y Foster Care payments)
- **June 18, 2010** transferred **\$4,637,478.37** to the **Payables** account and **\$1,978,405.01** to the **Payroll** account from the County's Concentration account for checks issued that week.
- **Total Term Investments**
  - 1/14/10 - **\$20,060,343.13** 6-mo. CD - Susquehanna Bank – **0.800%** - matures 7/15/10
  - 3/18/10 - **\$ 5,000,000.00** 9-mo. CD - Graystone Bank – **0.900%** - matures 12/16/10
  - 4/21/10 - **\$10,000,000.00** 3-mo. CD – Fulton Bank – **0.400%** - matures 7/21/10
  - 4/29/10 - **\$10,003,159.64** 3-mo. CD - Susquehanna Bank – **0.350%** - matures 7/29/10
  - 4/29/10 - **\$20,009,920.50** 6-mo. CD - Susquehanna Bank – **0.550%** - matures 10/28/10
- **Balance today in INVEST account \$1,376.50 rate 0.202%**
- **Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account \$58,560,029.48 rate 0.250%**  
(This rate is fixed for the month)
- **Balance today in First National Bank investment account \$7,517,415.96 rate 0.610%**  
(This rate equals today's PLGIT-Class interest rate of 0.060% plus 55 basis points)
- **Balance today in Citizens Bank Municipal Money Market account #6223510156 - \$15,485.61 rate 0.200%** (This rate is fixed for the month)
- **Balance today in Citizens Bank Municipal Money Market Checking account #6221269710 - \$11,538.27 rate 0.200%** (This rate is fixed for the month)
- **Balance today in Integrity Bank Money Market Checking account 1- #2206001209 - \$5,003,842.64 rate 0.850%** (This rate is fixed for the month)
- **Balance today in Integrity Bank Money Market Checking account 2- #2206001217 - \$5,004,520.78 rate 1.000%** (This rate is fixed for the month)
- **Balance today in PNC Bank investment account \$1,046.39 rate 0.200%** (This equals today's Fed Funds rate of 0.250% minus 5 basis points)
- **Balance today in Graystone Bank investment account \$1,031.24 rate 0.050%** (This equals today's Fed Funds rate of 0.250% minus 20 basis points)
- **Balance today in Metro Bank investment account \$101.26 rate 0.000%** (This equals today's 90-day T-Bill rate of 0.120% minus 25 basis points)

**No T.R.A.N. Line of Credit required for 2010.**

Mr. Yohe: Hopefully when all these CDs mature in July, we'll get some movement in the rates.

**REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR**

Mr. Saylor: I actually did have one item that I would like to bring before the Board of Commissioners. There has been discussion, over the last couple of weeks, about the possibility of adding an ATM machine in the Courthouse. I guess we had interest expressed from one institution in particular. Obviously having an ATM machine there would have some advantages for the Fines and Costs folks, the Courthouse Café and for folks who come in to serve on juries. The only concern that I would have for us is that we have many friends in the banking community. Mr. Yohe just read off a laundry list of them. The only way to properly proceed with this is to send out some kind of request for proposals to see what banks would be able to do this and then perhaps make some kind of decision from there. I think it will be an interesting process. I wanted to see if there were any objections from the Board.

Mr. Haste: We looked at this before. There are three ATMs within a half a block of the facility. You would just have to go outside.

Mr. Saylor: I was concerned structurally. I think there are some issues there. From what I understand with a brief conversation that I had with Edgar it was not definitive.

Mr. Haste: There are a number of freestanding. Couldn't we ask that it be a freestanding ATM?

Mr. Saylor: Yes, we could.

Mr. Haste: I would like to see it, because if you are saying about cutting into that marble, I'm not sure that is a good idea.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would like to explore of all those good friends that we have in there the one that would like to come in and do a surcharge free ATM. You will find that our friends will be less interested in doing it, but there may be some institution that would be willing to put one in here surcharge free, which is what I would like to find first. We probably would be able to negotiate lease free or something along those lines in order to get surcharge free. There are ways that you can play. Just keep that in mind that I would prefer a surcharge free machine. There are plenty around that charge a surcharge, but that would be a benefit to the employees and the people that are serving on jury duty and the people that come in and out of the county offices.

Mr. Saylor: Other than that I have nothing unless there are questions of me. (There was none.)

### **SOLICITOR'S REPORT – FRED LIGHTY, ESQ.**

Mr. Lighty: Commissioners, all the items on your Agenda listed under Matters Requiring Board Action, all the relevant ones have been reviewed by the Solicitor's Office and are ready for your consideration. I would be happy to answer any questions. (There was none.)

### **MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

- A. Training Packet.
- B. Satisfaction Piece for Gail D. Swanson on the property located at 2434 Adrian Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104 (\$2,681.00).
- C. Subordination Agreement for Monroe H. Crusoe on the property located at 1920 Manada Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104.
- D. Hotel Tax Distribution to Millersburg Borough for the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual 4<sup>th</sup> of July Fireworks event for \$2,000.
- E. Hotel Tax Distribution to K & W Engineers and Crossgates, Inc. for the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual K&W TecPort 5K Run/Walk for \$1,000.
- F. Construction and Demolition Waste Processing/Disposal Agreement between Dauphin County and Pine Grove Landfill, Inc.
- G. 2009 Real Estate Tax Refund to Kohn Road Tax Increment Financing Project - \$8,010.71.
- H. Lease Agreement between Dauphin County and Hewlett Packard Financial Services, Schedule No. 103108000036, for 55 PC's and 7 laptops to be distributed to various County departments.
- I. Purchase of Service Agreements between Area Agency on Aging and:
  - 1. Susquehanna Seniors, LLC
  - 2. Harrisburg Senior Care, LLC t/d/b/a Grayson View Harrisburg Assisted Living Community
  - 3. Angels on Call, LTD
  - 4. BRY & WMS Medical, Inc.
  - 5. Care 4 U Unlimited, LLC
  - 6. Alma Health LLC t/d/b/a MedStaffers
  - 7. EFCC Acquisition Corp t/d/b/a Extended Family Care
  - 8. ADDUS Health Care, Inc.
  - 9. Portraits of Life Adult Day Services, Inc.
  - 10. Messiah Home
  - 11. Emerald Senior Services, LLC
  - 12. Safe Haven Quality Care, LLC
  - 13. Visiting Nurses Association of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. (Contract #1)

14. Visiting Nurses Association of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. (Contract #2)
15. Center for Independent Living of Central Pennsylvania
16. Masonic Homes of The R.W. Grand Lodge of F&A.M.
17. United Cerebral Palsy of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. (Contract #1)
18. Cumberland/Perry ARC t/d/b/a Life Time Adult Daycare
19. ASSISTANCE-at-Home, Inc.
20. C&R Rhoads Enterprises, Inc.
21. Lee's Industries, Inc.
22. The Hetrick Center, P.C.
23. Abel Personnel
24. Widener University
25. Capital Area Transit
26. Yoffe & Yoffe
27. United Cerebral Palsy of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. (Contract #2)
28. United Cerebral Palsy of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. (Contract #3)
29. Dr. Michael Greevy
30. Vision Healthcare Services
31. Phillips Lifetime Systems Company

J. Purchase of Service Agreements between Children & Youth and:

1. County of Lancaster
2. Concern – Professional Service for Children, Youth and Families
3. Amudipes Residential and Day Treatment Facilities
4. The Children's Home of Reading, Inc.
5. Jonathan Z. Queen
6. William Shreve
7. Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Inc.
8. Kidspace National Centers, Inc.
9. Amendment #1 to the 09/10 Agreement with Pinkney's Vineyard of Faith Ministries
10. Carrie Smyth
11. RSR Realtors, Inc.

K. Lease Agreement between Dauphin County and 1001 Partners, LP.

L. City Island/Riverfront Park and Capital Area Greenbelt Park Permit Application.

M. Children & Youth Budget Certification Statement.

N. Adoption Assistance Agreements #2010-32, #2010-33, #2010-34, #2010-35 and #2010-37.

O. Purchase of Service Agreements between Drug and Alcohol and:

1. Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Inc.
2. Center for Behavioral Health H.A., Inc.
3. Clear Brook, Inc.
4. Colonial House, Inc.
5. Daystar Center for Spiritual Recovery
6. Firetree, Ltd.
7. H.E.A.R., Inc.
8. Mazzitti & Sullivan Counseling Services, Inc.
9. Naaman Center
10. UHS of Pennsylvania, Inc. t/d/b/a Roxbury Treatment Center
11. CONTACT Helpline

12. It Takes a Village
13. Pennsylvania Recovery Organizations Alliance, Inc.
14. Shalom House
15. Substance Abuse Services, Inc.
16. YWCA of Greater Harrisburg
17. Hamilton Health Center, Inc.
18. Lower Dauphin Communities That Care
19. Lower Paxton Youth Center
20. Olmsted Regional Recreation Board, Inc.
21. Amendment #1 to the 09/10 Agreement with ACCESS
22. Aids Community Alliance, Inc.
23. Barak, Inc.
24. Halifax Communities That Care, Inc.
25. New Beginnings Youth and Adult Services, Inc.
26. The Pennsylvania D.U.I. Association, Inc.
27. YMCA of Greater Harrisburg
28. Advanced Treatment Systems, Inc.
29. Eagleville Hospital
30. Genesis House, Inc.
31. Gaudenzia, Inc.
32. Pennsylvania Counseling Services, Inc.
33. Pyramid Healthcare, Inc.
34. Spanish American Civic Association for Equality, Inc.
35. Treatment Trends, Inc.
36. White Deer Run, Inc.

P. MH Purchase of Service Agreements between MH/MR and:

1. 106 Walnut Law Offices
2. Capital Area Intermediate Unit
3. Jaime L. Hunter, M.A., CCC-SLP
4. Heather L. Katchmore, M.A., CCC-SLP
5. James M. Petrascu, Esq.
6. Pediatric Physical Therapy, Inc.
7. Debra A. Ziegler, OTR/L
8. SpeechCare, Inc.
9. Alexcia Wheeler, M.A., CCC-SLP
10. Pinnacle Health Hospitals
11. Lynn Cummings, M.S., CCC-SLP
12. CMU
13. Stacy A. Foreman, M.S., CCC-SLP
14. Edgewater Psychiatric Center, Inc.
15. Victoria T. Kern, M.P.T.
16. Northwestern Human Services of the Susquehanna Valley t/d/b/a Susquehanna Developmental Services
17. Dr. Luciano Picchio
18. Bonnie R. Quackenbush, M.A., CCC-SLP
19. Brethren Housing Assoc. (HAP)
20. NHS Pennsylvania
21. Allegheny Valley School
22. Keystone Service Systems, Inc.
23. George Schultz

Q. Medical Assistance Transportation Program Agreement between MH/MR and Northwestern Human Services of the Susquehanna Valley t/d/b/a Susquehanna Developmental Services.

- R. Homeless Assistance Program Fund Agreements between MH/MR and:
  - 1. Shalom House
  - 2. YWCA of Greater Harrisburg
  - 3. Gaudenzia, Inc.
  - 4. Christian Churches United of the Tri-County Area
  - 5. Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Harrisburg, PA
  
- S. Human Services Development Fund (HSDF) Agreements between Dauphin County and:
  - 1. Capital Area Transit
  - 2. Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Harrisburg, Inc.
  - 3. Central Pennsylvania Food Bank, Inc.
  - 4. Pinnacle Health Hospitals, Inc. t/d/b/a Children's Resource Center
  - 5. Christian Churches United of the Tri-County Area, Inc.
  - 6. CONTACT Helpline, Inc.
  - 7. Community Action Commission, Inc.
  - 8. Family Support of Central PA, Inc.
  - 9. International Service Center, Inc.
  - 10. Pressley Ridge, Inc.
  - 11. The PROGRAM for Female Offenders of South Central Pennsylvania, Inc.
  - 12. Shalom House, Inc.
  - 13. United Cerebral Palsy of Central PA, Inc.
  - 14. Visiting Nurse Association of Central PA, Inc.
  - 15. YWCA of Greater Harrisburg, Inc.
  - 16. Capital Area Coalition on Homelessness, Inc.
  - 17. Halifax Communities That Care, Inc.
  - 18. Salvation Army
  
- T. Amendment #2 to the June 9, 2009 Contract between Dauphin County and L.R. Kimball, Inc. proposing a master planning effort to incorporate central booking, central/night court functions at Dauphin County Prison campus.
  
- U. Request for Exoneration of Real Estate Taxes RVG Management (Mobile Home) – Parcel #25-009-055-042-0088 (Jackie Smith) - \$1,113.49.
  
- V. Partial Refund of 2005-2010 Real Estate Taxes – Parcel #43-039-025 – Thomas Robison - \$1,372.38.
  
- W. Partial Refund of 2005-2010 Real Estate Taxes – Parcel #43-007-026 – Jennifer McCarron - \$1,338.42.
  
- X. Partial Refund of 2010 Real Estate Taxes – Parcel #01-049-023 – Cameron Partners, LLC - \$2,123.73.
  
- Y. Planned Maintenance Agreement between Dauphin County and Cummins Power System, LLC for Emergency Power Generator System for backup power at Adult Probation.
  
- Z. Natural Gas Transportation Rate Agreement between Dauphin County and UGI Utilities for a fixed rate natural gas transportation rate of \$3.50/MCF from July 2010 – June 2011 for the Dauphin County Prison boilers.
  
- AA. Emergency Management Performance Grant Agreement between Dauphin County and PEMA for Federal Fiscal Year 2010 for \$59,427.

- BB. Amendments to Human Services Development Fund (HSDF) Agreements between Dauphin County and:
  - 1. CAT – Amendment #2
  - 2. Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Harrisburg, Inc. – Amendment #3
- CC. Memorandum of Understanding between Dauphin County and The Pennsylvania Coalition to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.
- DD. Proposed Stipulation of Settlement of Sears, Roebuck & Co./Algon Realty Co., a/k/a Colonial Park Sears, Parcel #35-037-005, Docket No. 2007-CV-11403-TX.
- EE. Supplemental Retention Letter with Mette, Evans & Woodside.
- FF. Quit Claim Deed for Blue Mountain Building Stone Company for 10-acre tract in West Hanover Township.
- GG. JAG Waiver for PCCD Grant for Big Brother Big Sisters of the Capital Region.
- HH. Amendment between Dauphin County and Zelenkofske Axelrod LLC to adjust the scope of services and fees for audit.
- II. Grant-in-Aid Continuing Program for the Improvement of Adult Probation Services FY 2010-2011 Application and Agreement.
- JJ. JAG Waiver for PCCD Grant for Center for Healthy Families.
- KK. Purchase of Service Per Diem Rates between Children & Youth and:
  - 1. Adelphoi Village, Inc.
  - 2. Children’s Choice, Inc.
  - 3. Pinkey’s Vineyard of Faith
  - 4. 3-5-7 Model, LLC (Darla Henry)
  - 5. CHOR Youth & Family Services, Inc.
  - 6. Sarah A. Reed Childrens Center, Inc.
  - 7. Alternative Rehabilitation Communities, Inc.
  - 8. Jonathan Queen
  - 9. Seneca Residential and Day Treatment Services (Bob Friend)

Mr. Haste: We do have Items that require Board Action, Items A through KK. Are there any that need to be pulled out or voted on separately? (There was none.)

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve Matters Requiring Board Action, Items A through KK, listed above.**

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye and Mr. DiFrancesco – Aye; motion carried.

### **FORMER BUSINESS**

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would just like to thank all the staff that was involved in “Ride Your Bike to Work Day.” I think it was an overwhelming success. We had a lot of turnout, a

lot of enthusiasm from County employees who actually ride motorcycles. We also had a number of employees show up for the evening activity that did not ride motorcycles. They just came out to be part of the social atmosphere. It is always a good event. The weather was beautiful. I want to thank everybody who had a hand in organizing the day. I hope that we can do it again next year.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

(There was none.)

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Haste: We have correspondence that has been received by the Board this week listed on the Agenda, Items A through E, which will be handled by the staff accordingly.

- A. Notification from Vortex Environmental, Inc. advising that Landmark Homes is applying to DEP for General Permits GP-4, GP-7 and a Waiver of Permit Requirements for the proposed Ridgewood Subdivision in South Hanover Township.
- B. Notification from the PA Department of Military and Veterans Affairs advising that they have submitted a State-Only Operating Permit Renewal Application to DEP for the renewal of Fort Indiantown Gap's air quality permit #038-03047.
- C. Receipt of a letter from the United States Department of Commerce thanking the County for its participation in the 2010 Decennial Census Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) Program and asking that all LUCA Title 13 materials be destroyed or returned to the Census Bureau. (County LUCA Title 13 materials were destroyed.)
- D. Notification from Gannett Fleming advising that the West Hanover Township Water and Sewer Authority is proposing to make improvements to their existing wastewater treatment plant located in West Hanover Township and that the Authority is proposing to submit a new H2O PA Grant Application for funding Construction Activities related to the proposed improvement project to the Commonwealth Financing Authority for review and approval.
- E. Receipt of the 2009 County Adult Probation and Parole Annual Statistical Report.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: We are again at the point in time for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board? (There was none.)

We do have Retirement Board. We will convene at 11:00 a.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board adjourn.**

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk

Transcribed by: Richie-Ann Martz