



**DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**LEGISLATIVE MEETING**

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2003 (10:00 A.M.)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jeff Haste, Chairman  
Lowman Henry, Vice Chairman  
Anthony Petrucci, Secretary

**STAFF PRESENT**

Robert Burns, Chief Clerk; Julia Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk; Marie Rebuck, Controller; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Phil Spaseff, Recorder of Deeds; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; Jim Frandano, Information Technology; Sharon Manton, Director of Personnel; Rick Wynn, Director of Human Services; Mike Pries, Director of Safety and Security; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facility Maintenance; Jennifer Kocher, Director of Communications; Dan Robinson, Director of Economic Development; Jeff Foreman, Esq.; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office; Dan Mosel, Human Services; Gary Serhan, Controller's Office; Faye Fisher, Personnel; Sharon Ludwig, Personnel; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Diane McNaughton, Communications; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Dominick DeRose, Warden; Donna Price, Controller's Office; Shari Eagle, Information Technology; Jim Albert, Commissioners' Office; Amanda Chmiola, Commissioners' Office.

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Reggie Sheffield, Patriot-News; Tom Helsel; Loretta Barbee-Dare; Lou Verdelli, Public Financial Management; Scott Shearer, Public Financial Management; Patrick Judd, Whiting-Turner.

## **MINUTES**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Henry, Vice-Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

### **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Everyone observed a moment of silence

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Henry: I believe we handled all the Minutes that were before us at the Workshop Meeting.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Mr. Henry: Mr. Burns, may we have a report of Executive Sessions held between our meetings?

Mr. Burns: There was one Executive Session held and at that time legal matters were discussed.

Mr. Henry: Thank you.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Henry: At this time, do we have any members of the public who would like to address items on today's agenda? Seeing none, we'll move into departmental reports.

We have with us today Mr. Lou Verdelli of Public Financial Management who would like to discuss a proposal to restructure 2003 general obligation debt payments.

### **DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS**

- A. Lou Verdelli, Public Financial Management
  - 1. Proposal to restructure 2003 General Obligation Debt.

Mr. Verdelli: Good morning.

Mr. Petrucci: Good morning, Lou.

Mr. Haste: Good morning.

Mr. Henry: Good morning, Lou.

Mr. Verdelli: What I have prepared for you are two options for you to consider that would address the debt service that is scheduled to be paid here in 2003. These options are similar to two transactions that were done in 2000 where we were addressing reallocating the county's debt service more in line the useful life of the assets that these prior bond issues had financed. We have tried to show you two scenarios, one where you would move the debt service out a little bit further and one where you would just move it out a few years. To show you the difference in that is the one thing that is critical, before we look at them is a timing issue. That's the majority of your debt service payments on all your bond issues are scheduled in the early part of the fiscal year. They're coming March 1, March 15, April 15, and while you make payments semi-annually on all your bond issues the larger payment of the two in the fiscal year on most of your issues are coming up in the spring and then you have mostly just interest payments on the fall. So if you look at your cash flow they are much larger payments coming up here. So, if you were looking to reduce the total amount of debt service that you pay, it would be critical to be able to move these payments that are coming up and close on a transaction on these much larger payments in order to have more of an impact. The timing is critical in fact any financing that you would try and address this issue would need to be closed prior to March 1, the first payment. So when we back up with state approvals that are necessary whenever you do any financing, that requires a minimum of twenty days. We would have to look at a closing date of approximately February 27<sup>th</sup>. You need to back up twenty days when you would actually approve things. So we would probably need final approval at the latest next week if the goal was to meet that March 1 deadline of that first payment that's coming up.

With that said, turn to page one, I put together two summary pages that hopefully clearly illustrate options. In the upper left corner of page one, it says scenario one of assumptions refunds portions of the series 1993, 1998 & 2001 bond issues. There are just three issues that we would look at.

Under number one, issue 4.5 million of tax exempt bonds to restructure a portion of 2003 debt service payments. That will realize approximately 4.3 million dollars of debt service relief in the 2003 fiscal year. I tried to illustrate that with the chart on the bottom portion of the page.

The current debt service payments that the county is scheduled to make are shown by that red line. You can see in 2003 where the line is and it goes across and as your debt drops down 2012 at that point it runs pretty level format out through 2024. So what this option would do there in 2003 where the blue line is that would be the actual amount of debt service that would be required to be paid which is reduction of the 4.3 million

dollars. Where the debt service would be paid back in exchange for that relief are the little green lines across the top, and then in 2012 & 2013, that would be additional new debt service that would be otherwise would not be there. When we run all that on a present value basis of the relief in 2003 versus those increased payments out 2012 & 2013 it ends up to be an increase on a present value basis of \$141,000 for exchange of relief in the current fiscal year.

The second page that I put together is one where the debt service would not be deferred until 2012 & 2013 but instead to 2004 & 2005. So there at the lower portion of the page, while you would still recognize the same amount of reduction in 2003 you can see there that the green new debt service would all be structured in 2004 & 2005. What that basically does in column seven at the top is present value of additional debt service of \$122,000 for that option. Whereby either option is still reducing the 2003 debt service by the same amount 4.3 million approximately. That is the basic summary of the proposal in the time line and the rest of my numbers are just all of the different payments that would be selected for the restructuring. I just put those in for reference in case we needed to look at that. This is the basis of the proposal. I think if you are interested in moving timing is very critical on it. If we were to miss the March 1 payment date, that's about a \$315,000 reduction that you would have in the total benefit of the proposal. March 15<sup>th</sup> is very critical if we were to miss the March 15<sup>th</sup> date you would cut reduction almost in half.

Obviously, if you are interested in moving forward at this time, it would require a great deal of work from all the members of your financing team and budget & finance office to pull together the official statement and do all the necessary things we need to do to bring back a live proposal for you to lock in interest rates next week on this new issue. But we have talked to your bond counsel firms and they both seem to think that they can get the legal advertisements placed and the necessary things that need to happen in order to approval a bond issue.

My final comment would be that the general environment as you're all probably aware of interest rates continue to be a very close to forty year lows. We have actually, on the second to last page, in column fifty-six, if you were to do the issue where the debt is just deferred to 2004 & 2005, we are projecting that the interest rate on the 2004 payment would be 1.5% and on the 2005 payment would be 1.7%. Obviously, that's reflective of the federal reserve having short term interest rates close to forty year lows. So certainly, the interest rate environment continues to be very favorable if you were to move forward on this.

Mr. Henry: Lou, what are these obligations currently financed at. What is the interest rate that we would be restructuring from?

Mr. Verdelli: If you turn, and I apologize that there are not page numbers, the third page, which should in the upper left say, Series 1993, there in column three, on the 1993 piece that would be refunded, it's at 5.50%, if you turn to the next page, actually two more, where it says Bonds to be restructured, there in column fifteen, that one is at

4.25% and then on the 2001 issue, go back a few more pages, the one payment that would be restructured would be 5%.

Mr. Henry: Even in 2001, we were paying 5%?

Mr. Verdelli: Yes. It shows while overall long term rates were low in 2001 the fed has reduced short term rates in that period so much more. That we are now down to.....last night we did a bond issue for a local school district and the first four years all of them started with a 1%, 1.10, 1.20, 1.40 or 1.80 in the first four years of that financing.

Mr. Henry: Are there any other bond obligation series that are refinanceable that are at 4, 5, or 6% that we could refinance down to 1.5 or 1.7, or have we run through the number of refinancing that we can do on those obligations?

Mr. Verdelli: You have pretty much exhausted those opportunities with the exception of the two taxable pieces that were done in 2000. I think the last time I was here in October, I brought those up that there was around a \$50,000 savings if we were to refinance those taxable pieces. I think the total size of the bond issue was three million dollars. I was kind of borderline. I think that could still be considered if you decided to move forward on a transaction. Obviously, once you are moving and incurring an issuance cost, add on the refunding piece of those taxables really wouldn't cost any more and those savings may be attractive.

Mr. Henry: So we wouldn't necessarily increase the cost of the issuance but we could bring about a refinancing that would save about \$50,000.

Mr. Verdelli: Potentially, I would need to look back but I don't think much has changed since October on those, that taxable refunding.

Mr. Henry: We may want to look into that. If they are, I don't anticipate that they will stay this low for a very long period of time. Actually from the standpoint of the general economy, we should probably hope they don't. You ought to take a look at those two taxable pieces as well.....as a stand alone it might not make sense to do it but if we roll it in with something else it could be additional savings.

Mr. Verdelli: I think that was what we discussed in October or November, was that at the time that savings to go do that transaction by itself and incur the cost didn't make a lot of sense but if there was going to be something, we would probably look at those taxables to get some savings out of them.

Mr. Henry: Why don't we take a look at that because I could see that would get the 122 figure down substantially in terms of some savings for us.

Commissioners, do we have questions for Mr. Verdelli? He seems to have a lot of answers for us.

Mr. Haste: I'm fairly familiar....I prefer the second option over the first option. That's my preference. I believe that is the one that you are referring to.

Mr. Verdelli: Right.

Mr. Henry: Commissioner Petrucci?

Mr. Petrucci: Just some generalized comments to ask Mr. Verdelli for his responses in regard to the....from what I understand the TRAN that we did earlier this month was really designed to give us a line of credit to handle some of the cash flow problems as to when our bills come due as to when the revenue comes in for a good many of our programs. That really didn't solve some of our financial problems. A good part of our fiscal concerns for 2003, this year, is the huge pension fund allocation that we are going to have to make as well as this debt service that came due in a huge chunk in 2003. We are allowed largely to borrow money to pay for exceptional levels of expenses like the extraordinarily large pension fund contribution we are asked to make and things like that. But this really isn't doing that, this is basically restructuring of our debt program to allow us to handle a level of debt that we have this year that was extraordinary and blend it out over the next several years. It isn't really a savings of any money. It is indeed going to add a little cost but it does make more bearable in any particular year the levels of those payments. Is that fair?

Mr. Verdelli: That's correct.

Mr. Petrucci: What would be the additional cost added onto our debt be from undertaking this act? Is it in the neighborhood of about \$100,000 and some?

Mr. Verdelli: It's right on. In scenario one it was \$141,000 and in scenario two it was \$122,000. Those are estimates. Obviously, once interest rates would be finalized and other costs would be finalized...but it's probably in that ballpark.

Mr. Petrucci: So number two option has a little less cost associated because we are expediting the payment of the restructuring.

Mr. Verdelli: Exactly.

Mr. Petrucci: Thanks.

Mr. Verdelli: You're welcome.

Mr. Henry: If we are successful in refinancing part of the taxable, we could knock about \$50,000 off of that cost and get it down to about \$70,000 as the cost of doing it.

Mr. Verdelli: We would hope so.

Mr. Henry: I would like to echo Commissioner Haste's comments, as I expressed last week, I would have considerable difficulty with a refinancing that took debt payments from this year and pushed it out to taxpayers in 2012 & 2013. It is my understanding that nature of the situation as Mr. Yohe has laid it out that in the fourth quarter expending some considerable amounts of money on certain of our services predominantly human services which obviously we have to provide. We are not anticipating that the reimbursements from the state, I assume also the federal government,.....or does it all come from the state, Mike?

Mr. Yohe: It's all pass through.

Mr. Henry: It's passed through the state. That the reimbursements from the state will not come in the first or maybe the second quarter of next year. From this morning's legislative breakfast that the Chamber held, I think that we can anticipate that the State is going to be in a more dire circumstances from what we had initially suspected. Thus causing us not to get those reimbursements until next year or possibly later than expected. So if we took this payment and moved it from this year until next year and the year after, because we would have the same problem next year, it seems to me that all we are doing is moving the payments in line with the anticipated revenue flow from the state which is prudent. To go out ten or twelve years, I think we would be evading our responsibility. I'm willing to give my approval to go ahead sensing that we are getting that from the other two as well. If we go with what Jeff has suggested and pay back over the next two year....and also, last week I had a question as to whether this would increase our interest rates....it sounds like a substantial interest rate savings which would also make it appear to be prudent. I like the idea of taking a look at those two taxable issues. I know those were sort of hanging out there and we had thought about pucking them before so delaying that may have paid off. Anything else, if you guys want to take a look at while we are doing this, if we have that much of a drop in interest rates. ...anything that we can possibly look at I think.....if I, Commissioner Petrucci also accurately pointed out our cash flow difficulties stem from the additional general fund contribution to the pension fund. I think we need to take a very serious look .....I know we have a pension board meeting following this meeting....at ways to try to level that playing field out and bring about more predictability in terms of what our contributions from the county are going to need to be. In the current economic climate, they appear to be swinging wildly and not ever in our favor if I recall from the various reports we got from the pension fund.

Mr. Verdelli: Just to follow-up on the comment about looking at any of the other existing debt of the county. I think we brought this up before but unfortunately, many of the prior issues had long call features. When you look at your chart that the majority of the debt is paid over the next ten years. The problem with the majority of those issues is they have a ten year call feature. So we can't refund them until 2009 or 2010 and at that point the debt is almost paid off so there is not a large ability to generate savings when even though you are right, they are issues that have higher interest rates than today but unfortunately the call provisions prohibit us from touching several of those issues for many years yet.

Mr. Henry: We want to take advantage as much of the low interest rates as we can while they're there because they certainly aren't going to last. Do we have a consensus to allow Mr. Verdelli and our finance team to proceed?

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Henry: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any additional discussion, gentlemen?

All in favor signify by saying, Aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Verdelli: Thank you, so we will plan to be back....it's my understanding that your next meeting is next Tuesday.

Mr. Henry: Correct.

Mr. Verdelli: At 10:00?

Mr. Henry: Yes.

Mr. Verdelli: So we will be back with a final proposal with live interest rates for you to consider at that point.

Mr. Henry: Thank you, as always.

## **SALARY BOARD**

The Salary Board Minutes are on file in the Commissioners' Office.

## **PERSONNEL**

Mr. Henry: We'll now move into Personnel, Faye.

Ms. Fisher: Commissioners, there is a addendum to the personnel packet which you have copies of behind the green sheet. This is for a new hire in the facility maintenance department for a part time new hire. I would also like to make a correction to the personnel packet that was presented at last week's meeting. On the Workshop agenda Changes Listing, page 6, under requested action for #42, I would like to change that from termination to retirement. Again this is on the Workshop Agenda Changes Listing, page 6, #42.

Mr. Henry: That would be a retirement, not a termination?

Ms. Fisher: That is correct. The rest of the packet stands as it was presented.

Mr. Henry: Gentlemen, do we have any questions or comments relative to the proposed personnel packet? Apparently not, if so can we have a motion to approve the personnel packet?

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Henry: Thank you, Commissioner, do we have a second?

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Henry: All in favor, signify by saying, aye.

All: Aye.

### **OVERTIME**

Mr. Henry: Overtime, I guess is our next report.

Ms. Fisher: The overtime for pay period one, stands as presented.

Mr. Henry: Do we have a motion to approve the overtime report?

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Henry: Any comments? All in favor signify by saying, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Henry: Thank you, Faye.

Ms. Fisher: You're welcome.

Mr. Henry: Personnel has things organized and moving today.

### **PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Henry: Mr. Baratucci, good morning.

Mr. Baratucci: Good morning. You should have received a new purchase order packet yesterday. There was one item added to the packet it is actually on page 14. It is a

renewal of the electronic monitoring maintenance agreement for the equipment in Juvenile Probation. There is also a corresponding contract in your "Matters Requiring Board Action" for that. Some how that missed going through a meeting. There was a contract that was signed but it was not signed by everyone and did not get through a meeting. It is on your agenda so that we can get that officially approved and then there is a corresponding purchase order that was added on page 14. It is just the renewal of the electronic monitoring program in Juvenile Probation. It is the service agreement for the computer equipment and the home guard unit that the juveniles have that are on this program. That has been added since last week's packet.

In addition, there were some over budget items which we endeavored to clear up and I want to address two of them.

One is on page 22, I believe you received an email from Fred Lighty who kind of cleared this whole issue up. There were emails going back and forth as to how we were actually going to pay for this HIPPA cost. There is a contract that we signed for \$252,000. I found out we did end up paying \$20,000 as the contract called for actually about two weeks ago. The remaining balance is \$232,000 which is what the P.O. is being done for. I talked it over with Mike. He has \$125,000 budgeted in the General Fund. The way this is working is, it is being paid for all out of this General Fund account but there will be charge backs to all the other funds that should make up the difference. Fred did a very good job explaining it in his email that the exact cost to each department will not be known until these people start getting through their jobs that they are required for the contract. It all depends on the usage for each department. I do believe that the balance, after talking with Fred and Mike, will get reimbursed back to us by the various agencies, Human Service Agencies, Dauphin Manor, Domestic Relations, any of the funds that are not general fund. I do think we'll be okay there. Both Fred and Mike Yohe seem to think we will be fine there also. That is still showing an over budget on the paper but reimbursement should take care of that.

The other item.....

Mr. Henry: Before you move there. Was that contract not structured that part of the payments came due in 2003 & 2004?

Mr. Baratucci: No, in fact that was one of the things that was misrepresented in some of the emails that we could delay it until 2004. The contract actually called for a \$20,000 payment last year which we didn't make until this year. Then it requires six equal payments from January through June. That was one of the things.....

Mr. Henry: So we stretched it to 2002 & 2003, not 2003 & 2004?

Mr. Baratucci: A \$20,000 and majority of it this year. I think that is when they will actually be doing the work.

Mr. Henry: Okay.

Mr. Haste: Randy, who is going to keep tabs to make sure that what.....I don't think it's Fred's responsibility because he is the attorney to keep tabs to make sure that we do send these costs out to the appropriate agencies? Mike is that you? Are you going to.....who is going to watch this to make sure this does happen?

Mr. Baratucci: I believe in Fred's email he eluded to that, that someone needs to be designated to do that.

Mr. Haste: Who is that someone?

Mr. Baratucci: I don't think that someone has been designated yet.

Mr. Haste: I think we need to know that.

Mr. Baratucci: I think Garry Esworthy's name has been thrown around.

Mr. Henry: I wasn't going to say that....

Mr. Baratucci: I think he would be a great candidate.

Mr. Haste: Garry, sorry to put you on the spot. After I had a conversation with Fred, I did speak with Garry and it made sense that Garry. It made sense that Garry become our HIPPA coordinator. I know that at some point in time to designate him and maybe this is the appropriate time. It really wasn't planning on being this way but.....I would like to know before we move forward that someone is going to watch this, otherwise things may slip.

Mr. Henry: I think that we should have our personnel department meet with Mr. Esworthy and draft the appropriate addendum to his job description responsibilities and bring that back next week under our personnel packet. That is where we have been heading with that but we're not quite there yet. By next week we should be.

Mr. Haste: Isn't it already there, other duties as assigned?

Mr. Henry: As with many job functions, we need to be specific and frankly I think in terms of compliance, we may in fact need to have somebody so designated specifically. I think we should check with the attorneys and draft the appropriate job description so that we are covered from a HIPPA point of view as well.

Mr. Haste: Can we have that ready for next.....

Mr. Petrucci: I have noted in language coming from CCAP, of course all governments are hit with the same responsibilities. But CCAP has been asked by many of them to assist in coming together with a way of trying to reduce the impact of the costs of HIPPA. By coordinating and cooperating, I think they are able to try and extract

specialists who offer this service at less of a rate. I'm wondering if by acting, when we did, if we have put ourselves out of consideration for reduced cost of this service. Is there at this point, too late to hold this contract?

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, if I could interject. I believe that when Fred Lighty sent out the RFP, he did get a list from CCAP of vendors who they were recommending to perform the services.

Mr. Petrucci: So this was one of those firms that was recommended by CCAP?

Mr. Burns: I can't say that for certain. I think he used a list provided to him from CCAP and he may have then checked into this in Dauphin County as well. I don't know if Buchann was on the CCAP list.

Mr. Wynn: Actually we had a lot of contact with CCAP. They were very helpful in this. In fact, we went over all the people who turned in.....they helped us through the whole process. **Jeff ?????** with CCAP has become their in house expert. We have used them for this. That is one of the reasons that we were able to reduce the contract from its original amount. I understand your concern. We have been talking to them for over a year now.

Mr. Petrucci: Thank you.

Mr. Baratucci: The other item on the purchase order packet.....maybe this is a good time to basically stick to our guns here, on page 29, there is an item for Dauphin Manor...a consultant dietician. I have tried a couple of times to get an answer because there is only \$2,500 budgeted in that line item. They want to put through a yearly purchase order for this person for \$31,200. I'm not sure what the problem is but I have been unsuccessful in trying to get an answer. All the other issues that were on last week's Workshop budget wise have been cleared up but this one has not. I just checked five minutes before the meeting and no one has still come up with an answer. I do know this is a person that has been doing this in the past and I suspect that we're going to want to continue getting it. In fact, that was the only comment that I heard was from Chuck Lawson saying that it was needed. I don't doubt that it is. But for some reason, it's only \$2,565 budgeted in this line item. We can take either action. We can approve it and let the purchase order go forward and hope that it gets corrected. Or we can actually just hold the purchase order and not do it.

Mr. Henry: Hold the purchase order. They are responsible for making sure that the appropriate amounts are in the appropriate category before we approve it.

Mr. Baratucci: Okay, then we will hold that item on page 29 and the rest of the packet with that one addition should be approved. Then I have another item that is not on the packet. I don't know how you want to do it. If you want to approve the packet and then.....

Mr. Henry: That would be the mosaic tile?

Mr. Baratucci: Yes. It requires a little bit of an explanation I think also. This is a purchase order which is being proposed to be added to the packet. My understanding of this is, there was in some change orders that are coming through later in your packet today.....there was roughly a \$10,500 reduction cost in one of the change orders because we were changing the flooring in the Courthouse from tile to carpet. Anybody that is here and if I misspeak on any of these, please let me know because I'm getting this all from various sources. Later on after that change order was decided and included in part of the change order that you are going to approve....it was decided that now a portion of that does actually need to be tile. So this represents the \$5,575 a cost now to offset the \$10,500 credit which is part of the packet of change orders that you are going to approve if this makes any sense. My take on this is this would be an additional roughly \$4,900 over and above the net that you are going to see back on your items for board action under J. If you add all those up, I think it comes to a credit of \$600 and some. If you add this back which I feel you need to do to get a fair take on this, that would make it about \$4,900 over and above. I think Mike is aware of this and is accounting for it in the ongoing monitoring of the budget for this project. That's my take on this if anybody else wants to add anything to it. It would be something that I would like to add because I believe it is necessary to get a purchase order. We're doing this directly to the vendor which will save us some money rather than going back to Costanza again and requesting a change to the change order because they'll just add their little portion on. This will save us a few bucks going directly to the vendor. That's how I understand this request.

Mr. Haste: I guess, jumping out of order...Bob was going to talk about Item J maybe under his report. Bob, I know we had quite a bit of a discussion last week when you brought a report to us. It said that the total project was thirty-one million and you had identified some means and some future action that we would have to take to keep us on budget. How does this action affect your report of last week?

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, this should not impact it at all. I agree with Randy's explanation of this process and the cost of the mosaic tile was part of last week's presentation. So we have identified this cost for at least the last couple of months.

Mr. Haste: So this will keep the project within the thirty-one million dollar budget?

Mr. Burns: Yes, Commissioner.

Mr. Haste: Okay.

Mr. Henry: Did I hear you say, within budget?

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Henry: The thirty-one million dollar budget?

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Henry: Which is higher than the 29.8 million dollars that is projected to be spent at this point. Which thus makes us under budget. 29.8 million is less than 31 million even with my poor mathematic skills.

Mr. Baratucci: There are so many of those numbers I don't even want to go there. This is just a small.....we're talking about \$5,575....I don't think either way it's going to have a huge impact on.....whether it's 29 or 31 whatever the number is.

Mr. Henry: You don't think your \$5,000 is going to hurt our overall project.

Mr. Baratucci: I think we'll make it with this and I think it is a needed item. It should be added to the purchase orders.

Mr. Haste: I trust Bob will keep us on budget.

Mr. Henry: No doubt.

Mr. Baratucci: That concludes my report. I just need the action to approve the purchase order packet and add this item.

Mr. Henry: As a Change Order?

Mr. Baratucci: Just add it to the packet. It's not going to be an official change order for the project.

Mr. Henry: We don't need to take a separate vote as a change order then?

Mr. Baratucci: It's going to be a purchase order directly to the vendor.

Mr. Henry: So basically what we are going to propose is a motion to approve the packet except for page 29 and adding the one change order that Randy has before.

Mr. Haste: That's adding requisition #62378?

Mr. Baratucci: Correct.

Mr. Henry: Would you make that as a motion?

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Henry: Do we have a second?

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Henry: All in favor signify by saying, aye.

All: Aye.

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

Mr. Yohe: Good Morning, Commissioners, we have a short report today. We're back to our routine. I'll be reporting on our two week cycle. There are two payouts within that cycle. We've had two since our last meeting.

On January 17, 2003 which was a nonpay week we transferred \$560,360.78 to our payables account. This past Friday on the 24<sup>th</sup> was a pay week and we transferred \$8,982,133.62 to payables and \$1,796,662.36 to payroll. We are looking at almost \$9,000,000 payables included MH/MR's initial first quarter payment. We'll be seeing a big spike at the end of each quarter when they make their payments. We received that cash at the end of last week.

There are no term investments and no CD's outstanding. We still have the same \$119,893.64 at Invest and today's daily rate is at 1.26%. At First Union we have \$144,957.73 at a rate of 1.61%. In Northwest today, we have \$22,650,971.92 and our daily rate there is 2.5%.

Mr. Henry: Any questions?

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Henry: Thank you.

### **Report from the Office of Budget & Finance January 28, 2003**

- **January 17, 2003** transferred **\$560,360.78** to the **Payables** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **January 24, 2003** transferred **\$8,982,133.62** to the **Payables** account **and \$1,790,662.36** to the **Payroll** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **Total Term Investments – N/A**
- **Balance today in INVEST account \$119,893.64 rate 1.26%**
- **Balance today in First Union Money Market account \$ 144,957.73 rate 1.61%**

- Balance today in Northwest Savings Bank Money Market account \$22,650,971.92 rate 2.5%

## **REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – ROBERT BURNS**

Mr. Henry: Mr. Burns, report from Chief of Staff.

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, just one brief item today. It's been the position of the Board and Commissioner Haste over the last month or so to try to do everything we can to promote Dauphin County as a place to work and attract jobs. Our Dauphin County Department of Community and Economic Development has just received an award, a national award, from the Northeastern Economic Development Association for the Dauphin County Annual Report which Dan Robinson distributes to businesses and others in the community. That is some good news for our Economic Development Department.

Mr. Henry: Great.

Mr. Burns: That's all I have today.

Mr. Henry: Congratulations to Dan and his team.

## **MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

Mr. Henry: Matters requiring Board Action, we normally take the training packet separately. Are there any questions relative to the training packet? Mr. Burns, anything out of order in the Training Packet?

A. Training Packet

Mr. Burns: It's the same packet you received at the Workshop.

Mr. Henry: Okay.

Mr. Haste: I move that we accept the training packet.

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Henry: All in favor signify by saying, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Henry: That brings us to the other items on Matters Requiring Board Action. Would either of you like to exempt certain items for a separate vote?

B. Approval of FY02/03 Per Diem Rates between Children & Youth Agency and:

1.	Mission Home Ministries	
	Residential Female-short term	\$129.11/day
2.	Valley Youth House Committee, Inc.	
	Shelter	\$135.00/day
	SIL-Base Rate	\$118.00/day
	SIL-High Structure	\$140.00/day
	SIL-Single Apt. Transition	\$103.00/day
	Therapy	\$ 18.00/day
	Intensive Therapy	\$ 40.00/day
3.	Keystone Children & Family Services, Inc.	
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Vartan Way	
	Infants-6wks. to 12 mos.	\$140.00/wk
	Young toddler 13 to 24 mos.	\$132.50/wk
	Older toddler 25 to 36 mos.	\$125.00/wk
	Preschool 37 mos. +	\$113.00/wk
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Dauphin Co. Vo-Tech	
	Infants-6wks. to 12 mos.	\$120.00/wk
	Young toddler 13 to 24 mos.	\$115.00/wk
	Older toddler 25 to 36 mos.	\$110.00/wk
	Preschool 37 mos. +	\$105.00/wk
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Granite Street	
	Infants-6wks. to 12 mos.	\$140.00/wk
	Young toddler 13 to 24 mos.	\$132.50/wk
	Older toddler 25 to 36 mos.	\$125.00/wk
	Preschool 37 mos. +	\$113.00/wk
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Lang Manor	
	Full time preschool/K-5	\$100.00/wk
	Part time preschool/K-5	\$ 77.50/wk
	Summer school age	\$ 95.00/wk
	School Age-more than 2 hrs/day	\$ 66.45/wk
	School Age-less than 2 hrs/day	\$ 32.50/wk
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Martin Luther King, Jr.	
	Infants-6wks. to 12 mos.	\$140.00/wk
	Young toddler-13-24 mos.	\$132.50/wk
	Older toddler 25-36 mos.	\$125.00/wk
	Preschool-37 mos. +	\$113.00/wk
	Capital Area Head Start Day Care-Marshall Elementary	
	Infants 6 – 12 mos.	\$140.00/wk
	Young toddler 13-24 mos.	\$132.50/wk
	Older toddler 25-36 mos.	\$125.00/wk
4.	Center County Youth Service Bureau	
	Stepping Stone Transitional Living Program	\$100.00/day
	Zerbe Gap Group Care	\$140.00/day

C. Real Estate Tax Refunds:

1. Partial refund of 2002 Real Estate Taxes to Lois A. Kramer & Thomas A. Starr, 655 S. 26<sup>th</sup> St., Harrisburg, parcel #13-074-017, in the amt. of \$31.29.
2. Partial refund of 2001 & 2002 Real Estate Taxes to Dauphin Deposit, E Main St. & 12 E. Main St., Hummelstown Borough, parcel #'s 31-027-002 & 31-027-003, in the amt. of \$1,016.85.
3. Partial refund of January 1-June 30, 2002 Interim Real Estate Taxes to Scott A. & Kristie L. Wilson, 123 Graystone Drive, Hummelstown Borough, parcel #31-002-043, in the amt. of \$81.99.
4. Partial refund of 1997-2002 Real Estate Taxes to William M. & Tammy L. DeLiberty, 2325 Locust Lane, Derry Township, parcel #24-055-046, in the amt. of \$352.64.
5. Partial refund of 2001-2002 Real Estate Taxes to BT-NEWYO LLC, 1821 S. 19<sup>th</sup> Street, Swatara Township, parcel #'s 63-024-088 & 63-024-096, in the amt. of \$5,378.92.
6. Partial refund of 2002 Real Estate Taxes to Stanley S. & Phyllis J. Hughes, 5821 & 5829 Linglestown Road, Lower Paxton Township, parcel #'s 35-016-020 & 35-016-023, in the amt. of \$1,752.23.
7. Real Estate Tax Refund to Marianne Reider, Tax Collector Steelton Borough, on parcel #57-010-003, in the amt. of \$198.46. (Property owners tax payment check did not clear).

D. Reappoint Walter W. Cohen to the Dauphin County General Authority. Term will expire – January, 2008.

E. Year 2002 Liquid Fuels Report to be submitted to the PA Dept. of Transportation.

F. Municipal Planning Proposal and Agreement between Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency and SSI Services, Inc., to redo the 40 municipalities Emergency Operations Plan.

G. Addendum to Agreement between Dauphin Manor and Healthy Choice Staffing.

H. Appointments to the Dauphin County Council on Aging:  
(Terms 01/01/03 thru 12/31/05)

1. Kay Huber
2. Virginia Bruner
3. Michael Donaldson
4. Marielle Hazen

- I. Proposal for Telecommunications System Design Services between Dauphin County and Brinjac Engineering, Inc., for the Dauphin Manor project.
- J. Change Orders for Phase I renovations to the Dauphin County Courthouse:
  - 1. Change Order #2002-01-02 with L. R. Costanzo Co., Inc., General Contractor, Project #2002-01, in a credit amt. of \$42,852.19. (Revised last week's Change Order #2002-01-02 by deleting items previously listed on the same Change Order)
  - 2. Change Order #2002-01-04 with Edwin L. Heim, Company, Electrical Contractor, Project #2002-01, in an add amt. of \$39,237.56. (Revised last week's Change Order #2002-01-04 by deleting items previously listed on the same Change Order)
  - 3. Change Order #2002-01-05 with Triangle Communications, Inc., Security Contractor, Project #2002-01 in an add amt. of \$2,953.36.
- K. Satisfaction Piece with Barabar Fajt (Grill) for property located at 603 Lucknow Road, Harrisburg, payoff amount if \$3,500.00.
- L. Purchase of Service Agreement between the Dauphin County Human Services Director's Office and Capital Area Behavior Health Collaborative for the period of October 1, 2002 thru September 30, 2004.
- M. Governmental Services Payment Agreement between Dauphin County and The Redevelopment Authority of the City of Harrisburg; The School District of the City of Harrisburg; The City of Harrisburg and Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.
- N. Four (4) Telecom Non-Disclosure Agreements for planning and implementation of Phase I of Wireless Enhanced 911.
- O. Boiler Treatment Contract between Dauphin Manor and The Keeler Company, Inc.
- P. Radio System Maintenance Contract between Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency and Capital Area Communications.
- Q. 9-1-1 Inter-County Call Handling Agreement between Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency and Lebanon County.
- R. Professional Services Contract between Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency and Skelly and Loy for the Dauphin County Hazard Vulnerability Assessment & Mitigation Plan.

- S. Addendum to Contract between Dauphin County Information Technology and Government e-Management Solutions, Inc., "GEMS" NT Mitigation
- T. Extended Warranty and Support Services Agreement between Dauphin County Juvenile Probation and BI Incorporated.
- U. Contract Proposal from Zelenkofske & Axelrod, LLC to provide audit services pertaining to Drug & Alcohol for the period July 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002, in order to assure the proper transfer of balances to the new Drug & Alcohol Program as of January 1, 2003. The cost of these services will be \$14,500 to be divided between the county and non-profit corporation.

Mr. Petrucci: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a separate vote on item D and item U.

Mr. Henry: Commissioner Haste would you like to pull any items for a separate vote?

Mr. Haste: No, but I do have questions on a couple. Is Mr. Yohe still here? Mike, the Liquid Fuels report to PennDOT, what is our Liquid Fuels Fund balance?

Mr. Yohe: The cash balance the last time I looked was well over three million dollars. Our uncommitted fund balance should be in the half-million dollar range. I believe Marie from the Controller's Office does that report.

Mrs. Rebuck: It's prepared by staff in my office. You have the report, I don't have the figures in front of me.

Mr. Yohe: We have to keep the uncommitted or unreserved balance at a level of less than the revenues and we're right there around \$400,000. Our actual cash balance or our encumbered balance is over three million dollars right now.

Mr. Haste: So we are in good shape there?

Mr. Yohe: We're in very good shape. We are building up reserve to build some big bridge projects in the future.

Mr. Haste: Very good, thanks.

Mr. Henry: Mr. Burns, on item J, we had various proposed change orders last week relative to some additional projects for the Courthouse renovations. I don't see those on here. Are we just dropping those or how are we handling them?

Mr. Burns: Commissioner, that is somewhat confusing and I thought about asking the Solicitors to write some language but thought that would confuse it even further. What this is, in essence we are just dropping the two change orders which came before the Board. There was clearly no desire for the Board to approve the front entrance or the side walkway. So that has simply been removed from the two change orders you see on the agenda today, Items #1 & 2.

Mr. Henry: There was a change order that had received Board approval. Do we need to take action to cancel that change order? I believe it was in the neighborhood of \$35,000 or \$40,000. We took a vote on it and it passed on a two to one vote.

Mr. Burns: Commissioner, was that on the front entrance?

Mr. Henry: Yes.

Mr. Burns: Part of the change order identified as #1 under J with Costanzo is the credit for that work. The change order that you are referring to Commissioner I think totaled about \$92,000 and we are getting back a total of about \$74,000 in credits. They are all included. It's actually a very lengthy change order that's identified here as #1. So in essence the bottom line at the front entrance we spent about \$17,000 that we cannot recoup. The remaining \$74,000 is accounted for in this change order.

Mr. Henry: What was that \$17,000 spent on, do you know? Was it items ordered or....

Mr. Burns: I think specifically for the front entrance. Whether or not any of that was erected I not sure. If you would like an explanation from Patrick of Whiting Turner, he is here and could address that.

Mr. Judd: What the \$17,000 which we could not recover is accounted for is what you see installed, the plywood barricades, drywall barricades, as well as shop drawings designed for the glass and steel that has been ordered and then cancelled. The good news is we don't have glass on site and we don't have steel on site that we would have had to purchase. That is kind of the front end cost associated with....

Mr. Henry: So when is the drywall on the inside and the barricades on the outside going to be removed from the front of the Courthouse?

Mr. Judd: Given this approval today, within a week that stuff will come down.

Mr. Henry: Good. So essentially, the approval of these three change orders invalidate that last vote except the \$17,000 that was lost.

Mr. Burns: Correct, Commissioner.

Mr. Haste: Commissioner, can I just follow your question? Who is going to remove that barricade?

Mr. Judd: The contractor would....part of the \$17,000 was to install the barricade as well as take it down.

Mr. Haste: If our own staff were to remove that would we receive an additional savings?

Mr. Judd: Sure and essentially you bought the lumber. That's the County's to do with as they see fit.

Mr. Haste: Why don't we do that.

Mr. Henry: Have Buildings & Grounds remove it.

Mr. Haste: Right. Edgar.....

Mr. Cohen: I have a question...what is the savings versus our cost?

Mr. Henry: Our manpower cost?

Mr. Cohen: Yes.

Mr. Judd: We can work that back...it would be a credit towards a future change order. Essentially, if that is the direction, and Edgar has the manpower to do it...that's fine and we roll that savings into future work.

Mr. Cohen: I just want to make sure.....

Mr. Henry: Overtime for your department.

Mr. Cohen: I just want to make sure we're getting a decent savings versus a \$500-\$1,000 savings.

Mr. Haste: I know how to use a hammer and screwdriver. I can come in and help.

Mr. Cohen: I have no problem taking it down but I just want to make sure that we're getting a nice savings than paying more than what we should.

Mr. Haste: I think we ought look at it.

Mr. Henry: Also, we need to take due caution.....my concern ever since that thing has been erected is that it goes over that terrazzo floor which we want to take all due precautions to make sure we do not damage that floor in removing these items. Because number one, that's historical and I suspect the cost of restoration if any damage occurs will be immense.

Mr. Judd: You make a very good point, there is certain liability issues involved for instance the beautiful statue on Front Street. I would hate to see any damage to it. We can look into that and get costs together. I'm all for it but we do want to take precaution. Number one we don't want to damage the finishes, the statue, the terrazzo and the pieces of the Courthouse that those are fastened to.

Mr. Haste: I think that needs to be looked at.

Mr. Serhan: Change Order that was given for Costanzo, the \$91,000+..you have a credit change order which is the next one of \$42,000...that leaves around \$50,000 were does the \$17,000 come from...you just upped this contract \$50,000...see we monitor this in our office.

Mr. Henry: What happened to the other \$20,000 some?

Mr. Serhan: You approved, Commissioner Henry voted against it, but approved at the one Commissioners' meeting on September 24<sup>th</sup> a \$91,000 change order for Costanzo. Now we have a \$42,000 credit.....I can understand \$17,000...

Mr. Henry: Mr. Baratucci seems to have an answer.

Mr. Baratucci: There is again a bunch of emails which maybe you didn't get a chance to read yet in helping to understand this. This change order that's nets the \$42,000 actually has 23 items on it with additional costs which is another \$40,000 which is the difference. Although there is a change order of a net of \$42,000 credit, I have a copy of the change order and the first 23 items are additions to the Costanzo contract which if you take that into consideration along with the \$17,000 we spent that gets you the right figure. If you want to look at it, here it is.

Mr. Henry: It would appear that we are doing multiple tasks in one change order here which is causing some confusion. So we had the \$91,000-92,000 credit and we added some other items back in and the net is that we are losing \$17,000 in the whole deal which is a regrettable loss. Hold unto the lumber, Edgar, it's very expensive lumber. Is there any thing more? You're satisfied Gary, Edgar are you okay? Commissioner do you have anything more?

Mr. Petrucci: No, I'll move approval of Items B through U with the exception of Items D and U.

Mr. Henry: I will second.....and we'll pause for just a minute Commissioner Haste had to leave the room. He should be back momentarily.

Mr. Petrucci: Mr. Chairman, if I might can I just give the reasons for why I'm not going to vote for Items D and U. In regard to Item D, the appointment of Mr. Cohen to the General Authority. I'm not opposed to Mr. Cohen. I am opposed to the fact that I have not had representation on the General Authority for quite some time. I did at one time

have an appointment to that Board. It was conceded to the majority commissioners during the initial stages but we are now in the third and going into the fourth year and I still have no representation on that Board. So for proper representation on that Board, I will vote no to Mr. Cohen.

In regard to Item U, the purpose for me extracting that off. I voted against the privatization of the Drug & Alcohol Department. I did so because there was no apparent savings, no apparent improvement in programs and indeed here is an example of the additional costs associated with privatizing a department that in my mind did not need to be privatized. So that's the reason for my no vote on Item U.

Mr. Henry: Commissioner Haste, Commissioner Petrucci has moved and I have seconded approval of items B through T excluding Item D. Do you have any additional comments on any of those items or questions?

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Henry: All in favor signify by saying, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Henry: At this point, I would entertain a motion to approve Items D & U.

Mr. Haste: I will so move but I want to comment about U. I have been told that we should see a savings in the contract that will come up and the audit that will be done in July. I want to and I assume he, Mr. White, reads the minutes.....I will be looking for that savings come that time.

Mr. Henry: I'll second the motion to have it on the floor but Commissioner Haste has asked a number of questions relative to that and has a result brought assurances to us.....thank you for that. Commissioner Petrucci just on Item D, I'll note that Walter Cohen is a reappointment given the many matters that are pending before the General Authority, my belief at this point in time for the sake of consistency particularly with Mr. Cohen's background as a former Attorney General of Pennsylvania, that he should be reappointed at this time and allow the General Authority to continue the excellent progress that they have made in sorting out their affairs. With that, all in favor signify by saying, aye.

Mr. Haste & Mr. Henry: Aye.

Mr. Henry: Opposed?

Mr. Petrucci: No.

Mr. Henry: This was approved two to one.

## **FORMER BUSINESS**

Mr. Henry: I do not believe we have any before the Board.

Mr. Petrucci: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Henry: Maybe we do, Commissioner.

Mr. Petrucci: I do have an item for former business that I would like to raise with the Board. Since I have been back from Brazil, we have had a couple of meetings and I was anticipating some decision about the filling of the Chairman's seat on the Board of Commissioners. After sitting here for eleven years, I guess I shouldn't have really expected that I would get nominated for Chairman of the Board of Commissioners. But, being that as it may, I do think that we need to resolve that issue. I don't know that discussions are being had or whatever but I guess I have the right to assert my influence on the nature of that decision. As a Commissioner over the last twelve years, I haven't had the chance to give to many important votes but this may be one. So, I'm going to give it a try. In thinking about the position of Chair of this Board of Commissioners, I have looked over my two colleagues here and I have enjoyed working with all of my colleagues over the twelve years. But, I am of a mind that one of these gentlemen has a fairer sense, a closer sense to mind, of what this Board ought to be doing and how it ought to be doing it than one or the other. And so for trying to engender consideration and perhaps action on the item, I would like to make a motion that I nominate Jeff Haste to be Chair of the Board of Commissioners and I ask for a second for that.

Mr. Henry: The item was not on the agenda today so I'm not prepared to discuss it.

Mr. Haste: It feels like last night again. I guess that's what I'm here for. I'll second the motion.

Mr. Henry: Okay, all in favor signify by saying, aye.

Mr. Petrucci & Mr. Haste: Aye.

Mr. Henry: All opposed, no. It was not on the agenda so I will vote, no.

Mr. Haste: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Henry: Actually, I will give this over to you to handle the balance of the meeting.

Mr. Petrucci: My main concern has been and I think our financial difficulties that we are experiencing here today has been the extent which oversight over the departments have exceeded authority above and beyond what the codes have allowed. I think there needs to be respect for the Boards activities and the lessening of what oversight means. It does not mean the right to go out and run roughshod over issues. It does not mean

being able to contract with engineers and do stuff that gets us in fiscal difficulty. So, I think having worked with Mr. Haste that he does respect what I feel to be a fairer carrying on of activities here. So I appreciate his willingness to assume the Chairmanship. Thank you.

Mr. Henry: There is no doubt that what Commissioner Petrucci and I have had a different view as to how we should proceed in certain areas in county government and I have no doubt that those different views will continue.

Mr. Haste: I would just like to say....I understand where both Commissioner Henry and Commissioner Petrucci are on this. One of the things that I have said since I have been here is my hope is to make sure that we act as a Board and that we work in unified manner. I'm going to continue to stride for that and I hope we do act as a Board. As I said we are not three individual Commissioners, this is the place where we can debate those issues. We can talk about those issues but when we leave here we still are one Board. We may have differences of opinion on how we're going to run County government. We are one Board and hopefully the process allows us to do the best for the citizens. I hope we act as a Board.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Haste: Anything under new business?

### **COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSIONS AND ACTIONS**

Mr. Haste: Is there anything for Commissioners' discussions and actions.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Haste: Before us is the correspondence that has been received by the Board, Items A-G. Any discussion or comment on those?

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- A. Notification from ACT One Consultants, on behalf of Stratford Woods, Inc., indicating their intent to submit an application to DEP for a NPDES Phase II General Permit for discharge of stormwater associated with construction activities at the Stratford Woods Phase III, residential 26 lot single-family development.
- B. Notification from RT Environmental Services, Inc., on behalf of the PA Asphalt and Paving Association (PAPA), indicating their intent to submit to DEP permit application packages for coverage under the General Permit to cover the

beneficial re-use of reclaimed asphalt pavement materials. The Hummelstown Quarry Facility owned by Pennsy Supply, Inc., located on Route 39, Harrisburg, will be registered with DEP.

- C. Notification from RT Environmental Services, Inc., on behalf of the PA Asphalt and Paving Association (PAPA), indicating their intent to submit to DEP permit application packages for coverage under the General Permit to cover the beneficial re-use of reclaimed asphalt pavement materials. The Fiddlers Elbow Quarry facility owned by Pennsy Supply, Inc., located at North Union Street, Harrisburg, will be registered with DEP.
- D. Notification from RT Environmental Services, Inc., on behalf of the PA Asphalt and Paving Association (PAPA), indicating their intent to submit to DEP permit application packages for coverage under the General Permit to cover the beneficial re-use of reclaimed asphalt pavement materials. The Paxton Street facility owned by Pennsy Supply, Inc., located at 1001 Paxton Street, Harrisburg, will be registered with DEP.
- E. Notification from Dauphin Engineering Co., on behalf of the Central Dauphin School District, indicating they intend to apply to DEP for a PADEP/ACOE Joint Permit application for the final land development plan for the new Central Dauphin High School, West Hanover Township, Dauphin County.
- F. Received a copy of a letter from DEP addressed to Eastern Industries, Inc., Elizabethville Operation, Washington Township, Dauphin County indicating a permit correction to approve the utilization of Asphalt Baghouse Fines for Reclamation.
- G. Received copies of two letters from DEP addressed to Eastern Industries, Inc., Elizabethville Quarry & Quarry II Operation, Washington Township, referencing permit(s) and authorization to mine.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: Is there anything else from the public?

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Haste: Do I hear a motion for adjournment?

Mr. Henry: So moved.

Mr. Haste: Is there a second?

Mr. Petrucci: Second.

Mr. Haste: The meeting is adjourned.

Transcribed by: Shari Eagle  
January 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Burns, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

printed 04/03/03