



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Legislative Meeting

March 24, 2004 (10:00 AM)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Haste, Chairman
Dominic D. DiFrancesco, II, Vice Chairman
George P. Hartwick, III, Secretary

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief of Staff; Bill Tully, Solicitor; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Dan Robinson, DCED; Bruce Foreman, Solicitor's Office; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Steve Howe, Tax Assessment Director; Skip Memmi, DCED; Edgar Cohen, Maintenance Director; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; President Judge Kleinfelter; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Eileen Carson, Area Agency on Aging; Elke Moyer, Human Services; Fred Lighty, Solicitor's Office; Sharon Ludwig, Personnel; Dave Shreiber, Personnel; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Tom Guenther, IT Director; Jen Kocher, Communications Director; Diane McNaughton, Communications; Donna Price, Controller's Office; Mike Pries, Safety and Security Director; Richie Martz, Commissioners; Julia Nace, Chief of Clerk's Office; Bob Knupp, Solicitor's Office; Kacey Truax, Commissioners; Ed Chubb, Parks and Recreation; Kelly Wolf, Solid Waste and Recycling; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners.

GUESTS PRESENT

Mark Noble, Harrisburg East Mall; Jim Diamond, Prudential; Peter Carlucci, Esq., Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot, LLC; Bill Cluck, Esq.; Janis Schmees, PA Visitors Bureau, Greg Cook, Pa Visitors Bureau; Andrew Giorgione, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP; Dan Lispi, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP; Jack Sherzer, Patriot News.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, 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. Haste: At this time I would like to entertain a motion to approve the following minutes. The February 18th Workshop, the February 25th Legislative, the March 3rd Workshop and the March 10th Legislative. Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Hartwick made a motion to approve the meeting minutes and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco. Motion carried.

Mr. Haste: Next I will take the February 25th and the March 10th Salary Board Meeting Minutes.

Mr. DiFrancesco made a motion to approve the Salary Board Minutes and seconded by Ms. Rebeck. Motion carried.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Finally we have to approve the Election Board Minutes from February 25th of 2004. Is there a motion?

Mr. Haste made a motion to approve the Election Board Minutes and seconded by Mr. Hartwick. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING

(The Minutes for the Public Hearing are on file in the Commissioners Office.)

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor: Mr. Chairman we had, since our last Legislative meeting, two Executive Sessions. One on Friday, March 12th regarding Personnel and we held a second one on Wednesday, March 17th regarding both Personnel and Litigation issues.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Cluck: Good morning Commissioners. I am Bill Cluck. I live in Shipoke. I am a member of your Solid Waste Advisory Committee and I appear before you to reiterate the comments I made at the Workshop Meeting last week regarding Item C on the agenda today. First of all, note the agenda was not on the County's website and in fact it wasn't available in the lobby when I entered the building at 9:45AM.

At last week's Workshop Meeting I mentioned that I had never seen the proposed Ordinance # 3-2004. I had requested it at a meeting of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. I was told there would be no problem providing that to me. At five minutes after 10AM, I was handed a copy of the ordinance. I spent the last five minutes looking at it and the first issue that jumps out at me is the definition of regulated waste. All designated facilities that receive regulated waste under the proposed plan revision are supposed to pay a \$4.90 per ton administrative fee to the County. That's an important source of funding for your office of Solid Waste. The City of Harrisburg is exempt from the definition of regulated waste. That means any garbage generated within the City transported to the new incinerator, once the new plant takes effect, will not be subject to the \$4.90 fee. Of course, as a resident of Harrisburg this is pretty stupid for me to be arguing to pay more money. But as a County taxpayer looking at a \$19 million deficit I question the reasoning for exempting the City of Harrisburg from this fee. Now I have heard a legal argument that the City is grandfathered. I do not know the legal basis for that but I would assume that it is Section 506 of Act 101. If the basis for grandfathering is Section 506, I do not believe that applies at this point in time. Because the City and the Harrisburg Authority have amended their agreement so the contractual basis for grandfathering no longer exists. If you apply the reasoning to exempt Harrisburg then you must apply that reasoning for the York and Lancaster incinerators with respect to the Borough of Highspire and Swatara Township. That was the first issue that jumped out at me in reviewing the ordinance.

The second issue is regarding a newspaper article in the *Harrisburg Patriot* the other day. The County is proposing to own a recycling center. The County proposes to locate it in south Harrisburg at the location of the incinerator. First, let me congratulate the County. I think it is imperative that we do good things with recycling. You are doing an excellent job please continue that. But I question what alternatives were considered. Why south Harrisburg? Maybe it is a good location because that is where all of the waste goes now and it would just be convenient to bring recyclables there. Did we consider Upper Dauphin? Did we consider the possibility of a transfer station in Upper Dauphin to handle the recyclables in the upper portion of the County. To save those municipalities the transportation costs of coming down to south Harrisburg. That doesn't mean locating a new landfill. It doesn't mean all of the garbage in Upper Dauphin and truck traffic. It just means a consolidation point to make things easier. The reason I raise that example is because I believe Act 101 required the County to present those alternatives to your Solid Waste Advisory Committee before including them in your plan, which you are going to adopt today. I do not believe that we have done that. Now I think

you are going to hear a legal argument that, “this isn’t applicable to a non-substantial revision.” That may be so, but from a matter of public policy I think the Commissioners should be much more transparent about the way you do solid waste planning and I would hope in the future that you would actually use your Solid Waste Advisory Committee instead of having them as mere window dressings.

Finally, I note there is an enforcement provision in the ordinance. For non-compliance with the plan or the rules and regulations of the County we are proposing a criminal penalty. Why are we proposing a criminal penalty, if the idea is to encourage people to recycle? Now, I am someone who favors enforcement if it doesn’t work. But I don’t think criminal penalties for failing to recycle or failing to bring the garbage to the Harrisburg incinerator are appropriate from the County perspective; perhaps from the State perspective. Finally, I want the record to reflect one example of a facility that does not recycle is the PA Farm Show. Our State government facility, located in the City of Harrisburg, has not and does not recycle. I’ve put the City on notice. I’ve put the State on notice. But you go to any event at the Farm Show you don’t see recycling containers. They are not exempt from the law. Now if you are looking to balance your budget, \$25,000 per day in civil penalties are out there. If you want to whack the State this is one way to do it and encourage them to comply with their own law. I thank you for your attention and your patience and I look forward to hopefully working with you in the future on plant revisions, although this one I’m disappointed in. Thank you.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

JANIS SCHMEES, PRESIDENT OF THE HERSHEY CAPITAL REGION VISITORS BUREAU

Keystone State Games Open for Bid, 2005-2007

Ms. Schmees: I brought Greg Cook because he has been working on the Keystone Games. He does all of the sporting events at the Visitor’s Bureau. I thought if you had detailed questions he would be able to answer them better than I. We come forward with an opportunity. I didn’t feel comfortable walking away from the bid or going forward with the bid without engaging you, as Commissioners, to see how you felt about bringing the Keystone Games back to Dauphin County. We have an extension. The bid was actually due on March 1st. They would like to come back to Dauphin County because if you look at their history, they had the most participation with roughly 8,000 athletes when they were here. They were willing to extend the bid for four weeks. Really we have until the end of the month to make a decision. Great economic impact, great PR, but the downside is the cost to host it. It is \$125,000 cost each year, which would be paid prior to the event. You don’t pay for all three events up front. You do have to bid on three years at a time. If we decide that it is not good timing or economically we just can’t do it our opportunity to go after it again would be in three years.

Mr. Haste: You say it is \$125,000 per year?

Ms. Schmees: Right. Our operating budget can't absorb it right now. We would go and try to get sponsors for the event. Greg Cook was the past General Manager of the Harrisburg Heat and has expertise in garnering sponsorship support. That money would go back to whoever put up the \$125,000. I just didn't feel comfortable, worst case scenario, what if we don't get any sponsors? We need to be able to back that \$125,000.

Mr. Hartwick: A few questions. The first one is, any reason for the late nature of the request rather than trying to get to this a little earlier and develop a package that may offset some of those expenses?

Ms. Schmees: I apologize. Normally we would like to work more out front. This opportunity just came to us the last week of February and it was due on March 1st. But we knew there would be no way that we would be able to financially do it or put the bid together. In fact, if we decide now that we want to go forward we're going to have to spend every waking hour just to get that bid in on time. So, our first attempt was to look at our budget and go out to our Board and see if there is a way that we can absorb this cost because it would be good for the overall economy. It would have a positive impact for the County. After we exhausted those possibilities is when I put the call in to your office. Also, Dan Robinson and I had a conversation to see if there was any way Economic Development could support it.

Mr. Cook: Another reason for the timing delay is the project we were working on for the U.S. Figure Skating Championships for the Giant Center for 2007. That was a project that we expected to get wrapped up in November. Through no fault of ours, simply through some restructuring and some things that were occurring at U.S. Figure Skating in Colorado, that project actually dragged on until the middle of February.

Mr. Hartwick: Second question, for the investment of \$125,000 a year, do you have any economic impact figures about the total number of folks that are coming in, i.e. hotel revenues that could be generated? What would our investment return be if we chose to do this?

Mr. Cook: We would anticipate athlete participation at about 8,000. We think total attendees with family and friends is in the neighborhood of 20,000. Conservatively we believe economic impact would be \$2.25 million. We think that is a low, safe number.

Mr. Hartwick: That is a three-year number or a one year number?

Mr. Cook: That is a one-year number. We also conservatively estimate about 5,000 room nights for the hotels in the area.

Mr. Haste: What hotel tax would we get back off of the rooms?

Ms. Schmees: The hotel tax is 3% so whatever the rates that we negotiated. I don't have a number at this time. I can figure it out for you, but I don't have it off the top of my head today.

Mr. Hartwick: Where are the games held currently?

Mr. Cook: The games currently are in Luzerne/Lackawanna Counties, the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton area. They started at Penn State University in the early 1980's they went from Wilkes-Barre/Scranton from 1987-1989. Lehigh Valley/Allentown area had them from 1990-1992. There were two consecutive three-year runs in Harrisburg from 1993-1998. From 1999-2001 they were held in Johnstown and this August of 2004 will wrap-up their stay in Luzerne/Lackawanna Counties.

Ms. Schmees: Those counties are bidding again. We know that they are in the mix here. I did make some calls to the Mayor's office and I know that his office put up the bid money the last time and they also did the work. Apparently there wasn't a strong Visitor's Bureau present at the time that could help with some of the work, to help with the sponsorship opportunities. Therefore, all of the work kind of fell on the Mayor's office. We think we can help alleviate some of that with out expertise and also keep more of the games contained. They were spread all over. One of the reasons the Mayor's office was disappointed was that people were staying in Cumberland, Franklin or Lebanon County because the games were so spread out. One of our strategic goals would be to keep them more contained.

Mr. Hartwick: As a three-time gold medal winner of the Keystone State Games in wrestling, I certainly have a sentimental attachment to the games. I just want to make sure that we view this as an investment and we are sure with the return. It is asking for a long-term commitment for a significant amount of our hotel tax revenue. Obviously we are supposed to be making investments to try to lure in folks and provide incentive to put more heads on beds and create additional revenue. Are we being asked to act on this today or is this just strictly for informational purposes?

Ms. Schmees: We can do either. I guess I would just stress that we have a little over a week. We might be able to call them and stretch out this whole bid process. We have quite a bit of work to do to get it in on time at this point. The sooner we could come to a consensus the better. I am not here to push one-way or the other. When it is something this big that could impact our area, I didn't feel comfortable walking away from it without at least having a conversation.

Mr. Hartwick: Did you receive any commitments from the Mayor's office as it relates to any funding or assistance?

Ms. Schmees: They would assist us and help us so that we wouldn't have over-time costs and that type of thing with Parks and Rec and those different entities. They would assist us that way. Financially, they just are not at a place where they can.

Mr. Hartwick: Mr. Chairman, could we ask some questions over the next week and have this placed on next week's Workshop Agenda for action?

Mr. Haste: I don't know if that meets your time frame, does it?

Ms. Schmees: I don't know if we would be able to get another extension.

Mr. Haste: It really sounds like you need an answer today.

Ms. Schmees: Unfortunately, I feel badly that we have put you in this position because of the time frame. Is there a possibility we could get an extension?

Mr. Cook: I can contact Owen Costello at the Keystone Games and inform him of the process that we are going through and see if we are still not going to deter their normal chain of events in their selection process by trying to extend it a little bit more. The bids were originally due on March 1st I did extend to March 31st mainly due to the Figure Skating project. He had no problem with that, but I have not discussed anything beyond that date. I can approach that subject with him.

Mr. Haste: I'm going to think out loud here. Would we not be in a better situation to say we want to go hard in three years and put our ducks in order between now and then. Go out and find corporate sponsors and do a first class operation.

Ms. Schmees: That is a possibility. We can do that the next time we would be able to bid would be 2007 for the 2008 games. It seems like the bids go out about 1 year ahead of time.

Mr. Haste: Am I reading between the lines that we were basically asked to put in a bid? Someone is looking to come here? Is that what's going on here?

Mr. Cook: When Janis hired me about a year ago the position did not exist before. There was no one at the Visitor's Bureau who was actively pursuing this type of business. One of my jobs was to locate the events that are available for us to take a look at to bring to our area and this obviously was one of those events. The time just happened to be right where a bid was coming up. Regarding the sponsorships, if I could just offer from my personal experience, I am very confident that sponsorship money could be raised and would be raised for this event. However, I think it is more likely that that money will get raised when the event is a reality. If we can approach the businesses in the area and say the Keystone Games are coming here from 2005-2007 you'd get a much better response as opposed to "we'd like your support so that we can go after this event" and then have to go back to them and say sorry, we lost that event to Lehigh Valley or whatever the case may be. We can say we've got this event, it is coming here and then the business community is much more likely to put their support on the table at that time.

Ms. Schmees: Just to add some other thoughts. I think although we are in a rush to get the bid together, because there is a lot of detail, I don't want it to look like we are scrambling. To address your concerns. I think we can do a first-class event. We have time. Our time crunch right now is putting this bid together. We have to go out to the

hotels, we have to get room commitments, we have a lot of leg work to do that is time consuming to put our best foot forward on the bid process. What is the time frame where we would be informed if we won the bid?

Mr. Cook: The decision is expected in June. So that gives you about 14 months from the decision to the actual event taking place. The other thing that I neglected to mention, no one approached us and said we'd like to bring the games back to Harrisburg. However, everyone that I have spoken to that I've contacted venue-wise has been very positive about it. The community in general from the sports perspective is extremely interested in having the games come back. Everything that I hear from the games perspective from 1993-1998 is very positive. They liked this location. If they hold the event to one of the more extreme borders of the state they find that the participation lacks from the other side. When it is centrally located in Harrisburg the participation is highest because it is not that far for everyone to travel.

Mr. Hartwick: Judging by the numbers of participation it was highest in Harrisburg.

Mr. Cook: Correct.

Ms. Schmees: I think that is why they gave us an extension and are willing. I think if we can put together a nice bid and the package looks good I feel positive that we would have a good shot at it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How do you use an event like this to market the other venues in the area? How do you take this sports activity and turn it into people visiting the Civil War Museum, Whitaker Center, and Hershey Park? Are you going to be doing some homework around it and building a sort of comprehensive plan around something this big?

Ms. Schmees: That's a great question. That's what our services department is really all about. Once something is booked, a convention or tournament whatever it happens to be, they begin working, years out, with that client and our members collecting coupons or discounts. We put packages together at the registration tables so that when any of the folks are registering they get those packets. We are trying to spur, not just a great experience at the convention center or whichever venue it may be, but we're spurring activity throughout our County and Region.

Mr. Hartwick: Mr. Chairman I'd like to reiterate my request to see if there is any interest in Harrisburg to sort of give us one week to talk and communicate. We haven't had an opportunity before today to hear from you. Based upon how far we get in a week, I'd be more than willing to work with you in order to try to tie up some connections and to assist from the corporate side to try and see if we could bring somebody on board. I think it is a golden opportunity to bring individuals and revenue sources in. We always talk about great uses of our tourism dollars to attract folks into the Region to be able to as they say in the industry, put more heads on beds, to increase the additional revenue. Certainly, I am a fan of the games. I just need to know would the cost be offset by any

sponsorship opportunities or individuals who would step up to the plate and how would we work that out from a budgetary standpoint?

Ms. Schmees: That would be our plan. If I had the comfort level that in case that fell through worst-case scenario, which we don't think that would happen. But you always have to plan for the worst-case scenario. If we could raise all the dollars or even more we would put those dollars back into whatever fund they came out of. We're not here to make money on this. We're here to do what our purpose is in the area and that's to bring events like this in to your marketing arm.

Mr. Haste: I think that is what Greg was indicating. He felt fairly good that sponsorships would be there. The only way we could do this would be to take it out of the hotel tax funds. Dan, we have those funds available, do we not?

Mr. Robinson: We do. I would assume that this money would come out in 2005.

Ms. Schmees: Right.

Mr. Robinson: So the budget is obviously for 2005 this could be incorporated in that at that time. If it is a three year commitment, that would be \$375,000 over three years that you need to budget for.

Mr. Haste: Those funds are available we just need to shift some other things around, but they are there?

Mr. Robinson: These funds are currently available.

Ms. Schmees: We'd have to budget for \$125,000 in 2005 and then \$125,000 in 2006 and \$125,000 in 2007.

Mr. Robinson: Do I assume Janice that if we're not selected we're off the hook?

Ms. Schmees: That is correct.

Mr. Haste: If I remember correctly the games occur in the second or third week of August?

Mr. Cook: It is actually slightly earlier than that. The dates that we would project for 2005 would be, August 4th – 7th. Those are not set in stone.

Mr. Haste: Do we set those or do the Keystone Games themselves set those?

Mr. Cook: We can set those in accordance with them. Typically, it is a late July to early August window. You want to get the games to take place prior to any type of scholastic fall sports practices, which typically begin around the second week of August or so.

After events like the Big 33 game, which is typically the third weekend of July. That is the window. Historically it has been that first week into August.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Would the commitment of this \$125,000 to this project in any way limit you in other things you want to do? Especially with the three-year commitment, would this be a worthwhile venture in your opinion. We just came off of the skating bid and I'm assuming there are going to be other projects out there that we're going to have to invest money into. What is your outlook in terms of how many types of proposals will be coming down the pike and what are the types of costs that are normally associated with them?

Ms. Schmees: The cost usually comes with the sporting events. We're in conversation now to bring a small-mouth bass fishing competition here. We are equally excited about the Bass Pro Shop and some of the opportunities that we could partner with them. Typically if it is a national event or a national tournament there are going to be bid fees attached. We do have some in our budget we just don't have \$125,000, but we have put forth budget money so that Greg can go out and can continue to solicit these kind of groups. How many are there going to be or how many times are they going to come forward with these opportunities, I don't know yet. But I just want to have that partnership with all of you so that we can come forward and say okay we have another one what do we do now? Then talk about it and decide if it is the best use of our money or not.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As a Board we appreciate that partnership in being able to explore those opportunities.

Mr. Cook: Each event is going to be different also. The Figure Skating event, we were required to put together the budget on our end and we intended to cover the cost of the bid fee through the ticket sales of that event. That opportunity does not exist with the Keystone Games. Each event is going to be case-by-case.

Mr. DiFrancesco: My next question is who actually drives the Keystone State Games in terms of will there be other organizations out there competing for sponsorships for other things. How does the structure work? Is there a committee that runs the games and are they out trying to get major sponsors?

Mr. Cook: There is a committee that runs the games based out of Wilkes-Barre. For the most part they allow the local organizing committee to go out and get their own sponsorships for their own event in their own market.

Ms. Schmees: I think there are some state sponsors though that we can't be in conflict with and there are some regulations there. One of our jobs as a Visitor's Bureau is to do a case report. In other words, if we would have received the U.S. Figure Skating bid, if that would have been awarded to us we're not going to bid for something else in 2007 that major because we're not going to be able to get enough sponsorship dollars to support that. The next event that came along, if we had a choice between 2007 and

2008, we're going to push them to 2008. Trying to really map that out and make sure we are looking at it strategically and make sure that our area can support the things that we are going after.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have sent the games here before and we sort of have a feel for what it means to the area. I think one of the struggles that I think we're going to go through all the time is looking at investing money into programs that are very valuable and that will return a lot to the County and the Greater Region. Weighing that against the thought that the money that we invest and put out really is not recovered through programs like this. When we invest money into a program like this we're doing it to sustain the many businesses in the County. We are doing it to sustain the tourism of the area, but in terms of what we would expect as a return on our dollars obviously we are driven by real estate tax and these have little in return in terms of dollars. The most difficult part of this job I think is being able to weigh, when you are taking these very limited resources, the Hotel Tax money in this case, and putting it out there what is it in terms of worth to the community? I think this particular event would probably have a great deal of worth to the community. If we weren't sitting here on such a tight budget situation ourselves this probably would be more of a "no brainer" kind of project. But we do need to make hard decisions so I guess ultimately what I am saying is, I am certainly in favor of this type of activity.

Ms. Schmees: I know it's tough when you are trying to equate the exact return. Positive economic impact is certainly great but does it help your bottom line? I realize that. I guess one of the things that I would say I have seen in other destinations, the more you can bring these type of events it does begin to create an opportunity for other businesses that want to relocate. It's like a positive feeling that just starts to be created and is a snowball effect. Can I sit here and say, we bring it in 2006 will we have more businesses that want to come, no. But I think it's layering the positive message, tourism and business all the way around that we all work together and try to create that.

Mr. Hartwick: I need to make a formal motion to table this until we gather information to see if we gain an extension, to work with you to try and gain some corporate sponsors and a budget that we can put together for approval next week at the Workshop session. Communicating with you over the week and seeing how we are able to put a package together. I am certainly supportive. I would just like to have some of the details answered before I cast a formal vote. If that is a long motion, I so move that we table this to be considered next week at our Workshop session.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I second that motion.

Mr. Haste: Before we vote I have a couple questions. What happens if you don't get the two-week extension? Are you saying then that it is dead?

Mr. Hartwick: To be quite frank, I am not comfortable voting on something like that.

Mr. Haste: What information do you need between now and next week?

Mr. Hartwick: I'd like to see the investment returns of the \$375,000. Take a look significantly at our budget. See if we can start to line up some corporate sponsors and develop a game plan for the next three years.

Mr. Haste: You get \$22,500 out of Hotel Tax. If you had 5,000 rooms at \$50 per night at 3%, that's \$22,500 you'd get back out of the hotel tax. That may be a low number. I don't know what you are doing. I think that you get \$2.5 million back from the economy.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Ultimately the return is not going to be coming back to us. This investment is an investment in Dauphin County's economy.

Mr. Hartwick: I understand and that's why I support it. I would just like to see if we could line up a few corporate sponsorships.

Mr. Tully: Could I make a suggestion. Is there a possibility if you were hypothetically to approve, have them go forward with the bid package, with the understanding that the plug could be pulled if the numbers look like they are not going to work.

Mr. Haste: I assume you could do that. I didn't really want to do that because you hint that your not committed.

Ms. Schmees: I think what Mr. Tully is saying is that we go forward with the bid with the assumption that we are all pretty favorable towards it but in between the next week we talk some more. We submit the bid and if it gets down to the site visit period and we need to back out, we do so.

Mr. Haste: I think that is a better approach. Because I really think that if you delay it a week you are sending the wrong message that we are not really interested.

Ms. Schmees: Or that we are having trouble on our end.

Mr. Haste: As long as there is an escape out. This isn't coming out of General Fund dollars it's coming out of Hotel Tax dollars. The people who will be benefiting the most are those industries who I think would look for us to reinvest these monies into things that help. There are few events that are going to fill 5,000 beds in such a short amount of time in the middle of August.

Ms. Schmees: Right. Do you feel comfortable with that Commissioner Hartwick?

Mr. Hartwick: I believe there has been a motion made and seconded, if we could call that to a vote and then change it if necessary.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would be curious if we go to that vote to see.

Mr. Haste: Let's just vote, I'll be voting no, but let's just vote.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm trying to show respect but one week will not make a difference simply because we are not going to know any more a week from now than we do now. I do believe what was said here through the discussion is true. My biggest concern is are we going to be competing in this specific venue against other entities to get corporate sponsors. If in fact we won't be competing against other entities then I'm relatively certain that we will be able to find some sponsorships, I feel very comfortable with that. In my mind I am very comfortable voting on this today, as well.

Mr. Hartwick: Noting that we have two votes on the floor, I will amend my motion.

Mr. Hartwick made the motion to approve the project contingent upon receiving the appropriate answers over the next week (budget packet and corporate sponsors) this motion will give PA Visitor's Bureau the authority to prepare a bid. Mr. DiFrancesco seconds. All were in favor. Motion carries.

STEVE HOWE, DIRECTOR OF TAX ASSESSMENT/TAX CLAIM
Pictometry Grant Application

Mr. Howe: This is for informational purposes only. I provided you with a brochure from the company who we are going to seek a grant through, as well as printed comments, which I will provide to you quickly. On January 28th of this year various department representatives from the Sheriff's Department, CID, the District Attorney's Office and Susquehanna Township Police Chief Martin, representing the Counter Terrorism Task Force and the Assessment Office met with Dick Rothman who is a representative from Pictometry to demonstrate their product. Some of the departments were familiar with the product and all expressed a very high degree of interest in deploying it in their departments for various criminal investigation emergency response and planning and assessment purposes. The product provides low-level aerial photography between 1,500 ft. and 4,000 ft. detailing all real property in Dauphin County. Resolving at approximately 20,000 high-resolution images allowing for a user to take a virtual tour of every square foot of property within any particular jurisdiction from up to twelve different angles. Unlimited user software is a part of this process to allow for measuring distance, measuring height, area, and elevation of any property within the County simply from your desktop. The uses are virtually unlimited for anywhere from economic development to counter terrorism response issues. Further, the County is seeking to acquire the product to make it available to other political sub-divisions within the County at no additional charge from Pictometry. The County can also charge these other municipalities a user fee for access to their specific images, as well as, the software in an effort to recoup part of our initial cost or contractual investment. When we met in January a sample contract was provided. Typically the contract with Pictometry is a two-year agreement at a cost of approximately \$54,000 per year. The Commonwealth, through the Homeland Security Funding, has available a very similar type of grant to Pennsylvania Counties to acquire Pictometry. However, they are more than a year behind in that grant writing process. We wouldn't anticipate having anything through the Commonwealth Grant of Homeland Security money until probably some time in 2005.

Pictometry has contracted with a company called National Grants Conference, which is a nationally known grant writing company, to complete grant applications on behalf of potential Pictometry clients. What makes that even more appealing to us is that it doesn't cost the County or any particular client of Pictometry anything for that grant writing process nor does it affect the contract with Pictometry. NGC is aware of several grants that are available to pay for that process. I had some discussion with our EMA folks, particularly Greg Kline, relative to the contracts or the grants that are available. There are some that we may be interested in. There are some that we as a County would not want to participate in simply because it probably wouldn't make good political sense to compete with volunteer fire companies for the same type of funds. We would not want to compete on a County level with a local fire company trying to acquire equipment, those particular grants we would probably not be interested in. The question came to us last week whether or not we were interested in participating in this grant process. I contacted Commissioner Hartwick and with his approval we basically authorized NGC to proceed with the grant writing process knowing that Dauphin County has to ultimately sign the contract and accept the grant if we are awarded that. At that point in time we would certainly know if it is financially to our benefit to accept the grant or not. The ongoing costs for the process would be obviously shared out of the County budget by the different municipalities and the funding that we could recoup from those folks, as well as, any inter-departmental user fees that would contribute to the process. We would intend to use the software and the Pictometry images for any reassessment or any continuing update of property value process. It's a tremendous tool that allows through this virtual tour of every piece of real property in the County and having the ability to measure property through the aerial photography provides a tremendous tool to update property values and check on new construction and keep our systems more up-to-date and accurate. That's basically all I have. I'll try to answer any questions if you have any. I've provided you with a brochure. We can arrange at some point in time for you all to view a demonstration from these folks, which I think would be really helpful to see how the whole project works.

Mr. Haste: Just administratively, if this is for information purposes only why didn't you go to a workshop?

Mr. Howe: Because Commissioner Hartwick asked that because he made the decision to allow us to proceed he wanted it presented at the most immediate meeting, which was this one.

Mr. Hartwick: Before we move forward. We're not on the hook for any resource. He just asked for the ability to apply for the grant. I wanted to make sure that anything we talked about was brought in front of the Board as early as possible.

Mr. Haste: We should just try to do this at a Workshop, that's what they are for.

Mr. Howe: I understand.

Mr. Haste: Does this mean that we'll need less appraisers?

Mr. Howe: Probably not. It just allows us to more accurately identify properties where there has been change.

Mr. Haste: Which is what an appraiser does now, right?

Mr. Howe: Only through the field investigation, yes. Although, we are not able to get to every property within Dauphin County.

Mr. Haste: Okay. So you'll be able to do them more timely.

Mr. Howe: We'd be able to do it more timely.

Mr. Haste: Would that mean you'd bring revenue in sooner?

Mr. Howe: We may be able to do that. We don't bring in revenue we bring in assessed value. We may be able to do that, yes.

Mr. Haste: There is a technical question you answered. I think this is the same project we were talking about where I emailed you and you answered me.

Mr. Howe: Yes. They are actually low-level flyovers.

Mr. Haste: How often do they do those? The timing of that is what is going to drive how valuable this is. How often they do those flyovers and how quickly they get that imaged.

Mr. Howe: The flyovers are typically timed because of our region for early spring before leaf coverage and early fall after the leaves have fallen for obvious reasons.

Mr. Haste: Spring is a better time.

Mr. Howe: Probably because we don't have the snow issue and the whiteout issues. They will typically fly the County once every two years. That is their typical contract. They will however, fly the County as often as the County desires for it to be done. For example their one contract is with Hamilton County, which is in Cincinnati, Ohio. Cincinnati has it done twice a year because their Emergency Response and Terrorism folks want to know if they are going into a situation what the terrain and look is both with leaves and without foliage on the trees. They are opting to do it twice a year. Of course that drives the cost up considerably. For a county that size I believe their estimate is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500,000 per year to get the detail in the imagery that they are looking for. That's not by any means our proposal here.

Mr. Haste: All the law enforcement ones are really spin offs of this. Our real driving desire would be for the appraisal. Right?

Mr. Howe: Our driving desire for my being involved in it is for the appraisal process, yes. Obviously, no one is going to grant funds for reassessment so one of the departments applying for the grant would have to be one of the justice departments, CID or the DA's office. One of those folks can employ the technology for homeland security purposes. Because there is no limit to the use of the software or the images any County department or any municipality within the county has access to those images to use as they please. The contract with the grant is simply with one of the departments that could justify using the product for homeland security purposes.

Mr. Haste: Okay. Any further questions?

Mr. DiFrancesco: It is weighing on me now with what you said about the need for less assessment appraisers. I look at it from a general county perspective that at some time the investment that we are making into technology should start to show very real returns, in terms of, reduced staffing needs at some point. Not just with this project but throughout. I am not so certain that there is a common thread message that we are hearing back that it's not the case it's just different work. At some point the technology and the imaging and all of the things that we are bringing into County government should have some sort of a material impact.

Mr. Haste: It's not less people. It should be increased revenues.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Absolutely.

Mr. Howe: And that's true. That's what we would forecast. Not necessarily less people but more revenue more quickly to the tax bases of all the municipalities not just the County, but the school district as well.

Mr. Haste: As my colleague to the right often likes to ask. Does this mean you are going to develop a plan and show it to us?

Mr. Howe: We have a plan that was provided as part of the 2004 budget to increase revenue through the additional staff that you have allotted for us.

Mr. Haste: No, I'm talking about this project.

Mr. Howe: We can do that. I don't want to tell you that I can do something that I can't legitimately do. Thank you.

ED CHUBB, DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Proposal for services from Lefever Title Research, Inc. for searching the titles for all lands abutting and underlying the bed of the former Lykens Valley Railroad & Coal Company through Washington and Wiconisco Townships between Lykens Borough and Elizabethville Borough.

Mr. Chubb: We have a contract, and RFP, that we've received from Lefever Title Research Company. We need to look at the lands of the Lykens Valley Railroad between Elizabethville and Lykens in anticipation of the Lykens Valley Rail Trail feasibility study. We're fast tracking this section because we think we have an opportunity between the two towns, approximately six miles, to get a rail trail established in northern Dauphin County. We've gotten a good proposal from Lefever Title Research, which is before us today. The feasibility study seems like we're putting the cart before the horse but we have an opportunity here we feel to not have to deal with landowners. The rail trail or railroad bed essentially was sold back to the adjacent landowners over the last ten to twenty years. We are in a position with this piece of maybe not having to deal with quite the volume in other sections. It's not to say that in the future we wouldn't examine trying to establish the trail on other sections. What we like about this piece here is that it connects two towns in northern Dauphin County. Initially we have gotten favorable responses from two of the apparent owners. One of them is a municipal authority the other one a municipal government. We feel that we might have a great opportunity. Until we know the exact land ownership situation we can't say that for sure. So, this is an opportunity to look at the exact ownership situation and deal with the landowners we need to deal with. Again, initially looking at the tax maps, which I know are not for land ownership situations. This isn't exactly what you need to do, but it looks like we may have three landowners to deal with. Two of them, as I said are indicating a favorable response to us using their lands. We need to know this for sure and Lefever is going to provide us with a complete land ownership situation of the railroad bed between Lykens and Elizabethville. I think the Solicitor has the contract from Lefever. I've been working with Guy Beneventano on that. The rough numbers are between \$5,000-10,000, not to exceed \$10,000. It should be around \$5,000 but there were some 35 different partials he was going to have to do a search on. I think it is a great opportunity if you are familiar with the rail trail concept. Across the country, in Pennsylvania they are just great opportunities for the residents and their quality of life. People look for these things in economic development situations where businesses are looking to relocate. This is something they say they look for. If you can give their employees those opportunities it is a benefit. This is a step in the process of moving ahead with the whole Lykens Valley Rail Trail concept and we are really looking forward to see what we can do up there. It is a long-term process especially with the landownership situation as we have come to understand it up there.

Mr. Hartwick: I have one question. This is legal work that needs to be done, title searches and such trying to negotiate with the property owners? Is there any specific reason we cannot do that in house?

Mr. Tully: Title searches are usually tied to title companies. It is a specialty in the law. The efficiencies of having someone who knows what they are doing and has the database available to them is essentially why there are title companies. They have been doing title searches in that area for a period of time to develop their own data bases that allow them to do the thorough search so they can certify that indeed the title is clear. The critical part is making sure we are going to have clear title before we do any improvements and take responsibility for it.

Mr. Hartwick: With as many Solicitor's as we have and as large of a legal staff, it seems like something we could take care of in house. That would be my suggestion.

Mr. Tully: We will take that into consideration.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Isn't the liability the issue? Ultimately when you do these types of searches isn't it the fact that liability is the issue?

Mr. Tully: And then you want to be able to have the title insurance that protects you in the event that a challenge is there. I am not aware of anyone in our office that is certified and tied to a title company.

Mr. Hartwick: When I was the Mayor of Steelton there was a lot of property issues, all the time. It was up to our Solicitor to go out and do the title search and talk to the property owner and to negotiate. We never had to bring in any special counsel. We had a lot of issues with the steel mills and right of ways and issues with ownership. It was normally taken care of in house. I just wondered why we needed special consideration in this case.

Mr. Tully: At this particular point we do not have that specialty in house. If you were fortunate enough in Steelton to have someone who was affiliated with the title insurance company and was certified in that area then that's great for Steelton, but we do not have that here. Here's the concern. I'm not sure the amount of times we actually have to get into title searches that it would justify having someone salaried on line to be doing that. Sometimes it is far more cost effective to simply find the most cost effective person to do it and get it done, rather than having someone getting paid benefits and everything else to be rarely utilized.

Mr. Haste: This is covered out of your grant or the HATS funds?

Mr. Chubb: No, this would be a line item for consulting work and I have sufficient funds in there to cover that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In the overall trail length, how important is this component piece?

Mr. Chubb: I believe it is very critical. If we can get this accomplished between Lykens and Elizabethtown we get a complete section. You can go from one town to another for a straight 5 or 6 miles. It will provide a lot of pressure, if you will, in a positive way to expand the trail in other directions and have other people want to do it in their respective communities or neighborhoods. I think it is one of those things that we want to do a piece and show everybody what it's all about and how great it is. It's a field of dreams kind of thing, you build it and they are going to use it and like it and are going to want it. We have some challenges ahead of us in other sections that we have preliminarily identified with our study that we are doing from Millersburg to the Schuylkill County line. But this is the one piece that looks like we can do it and have a tremendous

impact. We want to try to get moving on it so that we can once, the feasibility study is done, we can look at how this is done. We can have something to point to and say here is what it is, here's what you can have if you want to do it here or if you want to do it there.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just a couple of comments and that is often times the real challenge facing these projects is in fact the multiple landowners along the way. Trying to negotiate with some who may want it and some who may not want it is difficult. If we have basically this portion of the rail bed held by three organizations and they are willing to come to the table I do believe it makes sense to move forward. I also like that critical point, at least this portion of it, the money is there as a budgeted item. I think this is a great idea and I would advocate moving forward.

Mr. Chubb: I will also add that this will serve as a multi-department affair too. We are working with Steve in Tax Assessment, the Recorder of Deeds and the Solicitor's office to pull this thing together. I think it is going to be a great learning experience for us as we get involved with other aspects of this particular project. This is a first step to try to make this a reality for Northern Dauphin County.

Mr. Hartwick: What is the cost for the proposal again?

Mr. Chubb: It's not to exceed \$10,000. I don't have the exact number but it will be somewhere in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range. Mr. Lefever said it should probably be closer to \$5,000 but it won't exceed \$10,000. Again, he doesn't know this until he gets in and begins looking at the deeds and sees how many deeds he has to look at and how far back he has to go. But he is familiar with that part of the County and his company is really pretty well regarded in the Recorder of Deeds office and among the legal establishment for doing what he does.

Mr. Hartwick: What do you have budgeted for those legal fees?

Mr. Chubb: I can cover the whole \$10,000.

Mr. Haste: Do you have a contract?

Mr. Chubb: We have a proposal from Lefever.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to accept their proposal? Then we will need to follow up with getting the contract.

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to accept a proposal from Lefever Title Research, Inc. for searching the titles for all lands abutting and underlying the bed of the former Lykens Valley Railroad & Coal Company through Washington and Wiconisco Townships between Lykens Borough and Elizabethville Borough. Mr. Haste seconded it. Mr. Haste—Aye. Mr. DiFrancesco—Aye. Mr. Hartwick—Aye. Motion carries.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: I have a few changes to the Personnel Packet that I submitted last week in addition to an addendum. In the new hires listing from last week, number 17, I would like to add the hourly rate of \$25.96. The range is 124, step is 3.

I'd also like to pull number 16, 20, 21 and 23.

I have a new hires listing addendum. These people need to start working before the next Legislative meeting. There is a changes listing addendum. These people are transferring effective March 29, 2004 with the exception of one. Item number 4 is retiring and coming back part-time. I have a changes listing addendum, promoting Robert Wentzel to the Director of EMA and Gregory Kline's supplemental pay will be stopped effective the 29th of March when Robert Wentzel takes over.

Mr. Hartwick: Just one question. First of all, I'd like to give kudos to Commissioner Haste, the oversight of the Prison. I noted in the last report that the overtime dropped significantly over the same quarter from the previous year. That being said, I was also concerned that with the request for an additional 1500 hours of Prison overtime from the Warden. The question I had was in the past 2 weeks the overtime has dropped significantly and now we are receiving a request for 1500 additional hours of overtime. If you could bring some light to that request.

Mr. Haste: That request is received every pay period. The 1500 is not to exceed so they have authorization to go ahead. The overtime is required under the Union contract. There is nothing special about the 1500. You are right, it has been about 240. Pay period four was about 1,070, which was our highest so far this year. So the 1500 is just a standard request we get every pay period. We probably could lower that if we wanted to although as I said we did hit 1,070 in pay period four. It's just their ceiling on overtime. If they wanted to go over that we would hold a special meeting to deal with it.

Mr. Hartwick: So, this is no special request for additional overtime? We are still going to see those numbers drop hopefully when the new guards come on. This is just a request for that overtime, if necessary, but it will be monitored bi-weekly.

Mr. Haste: Right. Actually it is anticipated that it will spike come summertime and vacation time. We are trying to even manage that spike.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would like to talk very briefly about the process that went through the decision to replace the EMA Director. Filling the position was taken very seriously. We had a very strong, long-term person in that position who chose to retire and this Board was very concerned with making sure that we made a good solid choice to replace him. Basically we put together a process by which the folks that will have the most direct impact on his abilities got the first opportunity to look at the candidates and suggest to us who they thought was qualified. Then the Board had the opportunity to meet with the

candidates, do the interviews and select who we thought was the best one. Throughout the process we had folks from the community come in and help us evaluate the candidates, everybody did a fine job. The candidates that we had the opportunity to talk to commented about how great the process was. They had never gone through a process like this where they felt it was so complete where the candidates were asked the right questions. I am here today to say that I think we made a very solid selection in Robb. I think he will serve us very well. As we all know there are a lot of changes coming up within that department. They are going to have a lot of issues to address and I think he is the right guy to lead them on our behalf.

Mr. Haste: I agree. Is there a motion to approve the Personnel Packet as amended by Kay?

Mr. Hartwick moved to approve the amended Personnel Packet. Mr. DiFrancesco seconded it. Mr. Haste—Aye. Mr. DiFrancesco—Aye. Mr. Hartwick—Aye. Motion carries.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: Commissioners your new packet has all of the budget items from last week corrected. There was one additional item that we added since the Workshop and that is on page 35. What it is I'm told is that we had an individual offering quality assurance services out at Spring Creek from Dec. 30, 2003 through the end of February 2004. That person's duties were relieved once ZA Consulting took over. We evidently owed her for a contract that we okayed for \$3,310, that's shown on page 35. The item is listed there under consulting services. I got a memo from Spring Creek and Nick, mentioning that we would change that code to the code that we have been paying ZA Consulting out of, which is 803-111. This is a contracted services code. That code still does have the budget issues that are being worked on currently. Commissioner DiFrancesco has said that we are still working through that. If you approve that it will be in that code and will be part of the amount that we will need to fix as we get the ZA recommendations moved into the budget items. The packet is there for your approval as it was last week with the item added on page 35. Do you have any questions?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Let me take a moment to actually comment. I think it is important for me to continue to bring the Board up to speed with what's going on. Like you, I get a little nuts every time I see those little asterisks apply to unbudgeted money. Right now there are a number of steps being taken and it is my understanding that a number of the contracts that were under review for renegotiation should be put in place as soon as next week. This is where we will start to see some of the savings that ZA has recommended. Therefore that will really be the first opportunity to start shifting money around. Until we can make those formal changes and get the new vendors in, in those cases, or even renegotiate contracts, which some of them will be, we don't start to see the reduced cost to us. A lot of this stuff is going to start happening again over the next couple of weeks, but again we are going to see asterisks until we start moving funds from one line item to another. Just another note, we are obviously reorganizing a lot of

other things to include the business office and some of the recommended changes that will take place in the business office will result in additional revenue as well. We're reducing costs we're raising revenue nothing is official yet but when we start moving I'll be the first one to celebrate and bring it to you attention.

Mr. Haste: Anything else? Is there a motion to approve the Purchase Order Packet?

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to approve the Purchase Order Packet. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. Mr. Haste—Aye. Mr. DiFrancesco—Aye. Mr. Hartwick—Aye. Motion carries.

REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR

Report from the Office of Budget & Finance March 24, 2004

- **March 12, 2004** transferred **\$436,010.94** to the **Payables** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **March 19, 2004** transferred **\$4,688,373.93** to the **Payables** account **and \$1,819,046.71** 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 \$121,436.47 rate 0.96%**
- **Balance today in Community Banks Money Market account \$28,597,390.17 rate 2.00%**
(This rate is good through April 2004)

\$15M TRAN Line-of-Credit Status at PNC:

- Draw #1 on 2/5/04 - \$2,850,000.00
 - Draw #2 on 2/19/04 - \$1,800,000.00
- Total \$4,650,000.00

Mr. Yohe: We had no term investments. I did discuss some term investments with Commerce Bank last week and even a year long CD at this point, or a fixed term rate, is only in the mid 1 range, 1.4 to 1.5%. Community Banks is still giving us an above market deal at this point in time. In Invest at my account that we just keep there just for comparison sake we have \$121,436.47 and that's at .96%. In Community today we have \$28,597,390.17. That should go up significantly two weeks from now on the next report. The taxes are coming in. I don't anticipate any more withdrawals on the line of credit. Next week after the payroll I'm going to pay that off.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: Chairman, I have one item in the community interest category. Senators Chip Brightbill and John Gordner are sponsoring an event, the Kids Expo. It will be held this Saturday from 11am to 2pm. Many guests will be taking part including the County Recycling and the Mascot. It is at the Grace United Methodist Church in Millersburg.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT—BILL TULLY, ESQ., SOLICITOR

Mr. Tully: Nothing to add and I'd be happy to take any questions.

Mr. Haste: Any questions of Bill?

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

Mr. Haste: The first thing I see is the Training Packet. Anything we need to know there Chad?

Mr. Saylor: There were nine and three have been added. Everything has been pre-approved.

Mr. Haste: We have items A through Z on today's agenda for Board action. Are there any items there that any member would like to pull out separately? Is there a motion to approve items A through Z?

- A. Training Packet
- B. Approval of FY03/04 Per Diem rates between Children & Youth and:
 - 1. Contact Helpline
Safe Haven DPW Grant \$6,000.00 (Mar. thru June)
 - 2. York County Youth Development Center
Detention (1/02/04-6/30/04) \$249.30/day
 - 3. ChildFirst Services, Inc.
Baby with mother \$45.00/day
- C. Adopt Ordinance #3-2004 authorizing and approving the 2004 Non-substantial revision to the County's Municipal Solid Waste Management Plan and providing for the comprehensive management, including the processing, disposal and recycling of municipal solid waste generated in the County.
- D. Non-emergency Medical Transportation Services Agreement with South Central Emergency Medical Services for Spring Creek.
- E. Exoneration of 2003 Delinquent County Taxes for the Calvary Independent Church property located at 6300 State Route 209, Lykens, PA, parcel #69-014-020 in the amt. of \$844.67.

- F. Approval of the following union contracts:
1. Teamsters Local 776 – Court Appointed Professionals (Adult/Juvenile Probation and Domestic Relations- Jan. 1, 2003 to Dec. 31, 2006)
 2. Dauphin County Detectives Association (Jan. 1, 2004 to Dec. 31, 2006)
- G. Satisfaction Pieces for the following individuals:
1. Michelle A. Paluscio for property located at 901 Monroe Street, Steelton, PA.
 2. Thomas and Pamela Woods for property located at 2715 Banks Street, Harrisburg, PA.
- H. Subordination Agreements for the following individuals:
1. Jeffrey & Hanell Weaser for property located at 563 Second Street, Enhaut, PA.
 2. Philisha L. Gray for property located at 237 Maclay Street, Harrisburg, PA.
 3. Neil and Reyna Scott for property located at 932 Cocoa Ave., Hershey, PA.
- I. Approval of RFP language for Benefit Brokers/Consultants.
- J. Lease Agreement between Dauphin County and Hasler Financial Services, LLC for postal equipment located in the County Mail Room.
- K. Maintenance Agreement between Dauphin County and Kenney Mechanicals for equipment located in the Veterans Memorial Building.
- L. Electronic Monitoring Equipment Agreement between Dauphin County Juvenile Probation and BI, Inc., for equipment located in the Juvenile Probation Department.
- M. Authorize the County Solicitor to terminate the Special Counsel Agreements with Kevin McKeon, Esq., effective May 5, 2004.
- N. Adopt Resolution No. 7-2004 – County Right-To-Know Policy.
- O. Delta Dental of Pennsylvania contracts for the following county employees:
1. County Probation Officers/IBT Local #776
 2. Amendment to Schedule II of the County Probation Officers/IBT Local #776
 3. County Prison Guards/IBT Local 776
 4. Amendment to Schedule II of the Prison Guards/IBT Local #776
 5. County Court Related Non-Professionals/IBT Local #776
 6. Amendment to Schedule II of the County Court Related Non-Professionals/IBT Local #776
- P. Approval by the Board of Commissioners to contribute its *pro rata* share for appraisal services needed to ascertain the true value of the following:
1. PNC Bank Properties located at 909 West Governor Rd, Derry Twp., parcel # 24-029-021 in the amt. of \$420.00.
 2. Uptown Partners, LP; Landex Corp., properties located in the 10th and 11th Wards of Harrisburg City, 59 separate tax parcels.

- Q. Adoption Assistance Agreements:
1. 2004-04
 2. 2004-08
 3. 2004-09
- R. Purchase of Service Agreements between Dauphin County Children & Youth Agency and:
1. The Devereux Foundation for FY02/03
 2. The Devereux Foundation for FY03/04
- S. Amendment #1 to FY03/04 Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County Children & Youth Agency and Chariots, LLC.
- T. Human Services Development Fund Grant Agreements for FY03/04 between the Dauphin County Human Services and:
1. Parents Anonymous
 2. International Service Center
 3. Catholic Charities
 4. Upper Dauphin Human Services Center, Inc.
 5. CONTACT Helpline
 6. Community Action Commission
 7. ParentWorks
 8. The PROGRAM for Female Offenders, Inc.
 9. Puerto Rican Organizing Committee
- U. Amendment #1 to FY03/04 Human Services Development Fund Grant Agreements with:
1. ACCEPT Supportive Care
 2. Courteous Rentals/Airport Limo
- V. Agreement between Dauphin County and Intercon Automation to maintain HVAC Equipment located in the Human Services Building.
- W. Ratify Notice of Cancellation of Contract between Dauphin County and Mobile X-Ray Imaging, Inc., for services at Spring Creek.
- X. Ratify a Contract between Dauphin County/Spring Creek and Symphony Diagnostic Services No. 1, Inc., d/b/a MobilexUSA for services at Spring Creek.
- Y. Amendment #1 to FY03/04 Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County Area Agency on Aging and Heinz-Menaker Senior Center.
- Z. Partial Refund of 2003 Real Estate Taxes to Roland & Luella Cope, Enders Rd., Jackson Township, parcel #'s 32-020-078 & 32-020-080 in the amt. of \$77.48

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to approve the Training Packet, including all items A through Z. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. Mr. Haste—Aye. Mr. DiFrancesco—Aye. Mr. Hartwick—Aye. Motion carries.

FORMER BUSINESS

(There was no former business.)

NEW BUSINESS

(There was no new business.)

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

Mr. Haste: I just have one suggestion. I have had this discussion with Mike and with Chad. I would like them to put their heads together and bring something to us next week. One of the things I have been getting nervous with as we are moving through is the number of new hires that we have seen and some of the hires that are out there. I know there's been some build up or penned up demand but I would think having gone through a quarter hopefully the critical positions we have dealt with. I would like them to review all positions, but in particular the general fund positions. I am looking at the bottom line of the budget. I would ask that you come up with a plan where we look at slowing that down. Whether it be a freeze for a period of time, and whether we identify three dates since we have three quarters left that we will consider hiring only at those points in times in the quarter. I am really looking at slowing the process down. We could have three hiring times over the next three quarters. I would want a justification of that position from either a service that is going to be cut or revenue that will not be received, or if we hire a position the justification of revenue increase. I think it needs to be driven by quality of service and bottom line on the budget particularly on the revenue side.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm sure you have seen on our scheduled events that we've changed the way that we looked at the HSDF Grants for this year. Obviously we were uncertain whether or not we would have restorative funding in the HSDF area. We are grateful for the restorative funding although it wasn't for the amount asked we received a significant amount of money that was restored by the budget. However, the plan initially was before we had made some changes in Human Services to extend those contracts out for 18 months and to do all of the contracts in one RFP process. We've changed that up a little bit and we are taking a look at the way we give HSDF money to the local service organizations. We've applied and are drawing up a new set of standards, which is outcome based performance measured. We will be going out to those individual organizations that have served the County well in the past letting them know of the new standards that they will be required to meet, and letting them know they are going to be evaluated based upon outcomes. It will no longer be if you had a relationship with the County. If you're not performing well you are not guaranteed funding in the future. Ultimately we will be judging you on the value of your services and how you relay those services to the people that you serve. I'm going to be doing that in a nice way by delivering the check for this years allocation from the HSDF Fund but making sure the Board is very clear with the new set of standards and reporting requirements and the outcomes that we desire from those organizations. We're only going to fund for HSDF

until June and then we are going to do a new set of RFP's and re-approve that process for the remainder of the 12 months that had initially been planned for.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Two comments. First of all I will probably make the same comment at every meeting for the rest of the year and that is to reemphasize the fact that again to the Directors, Row Officers and anyone in control of a budget in Dauphin County we are again closing in on the time when we need to look at budgets and make hard decisions for next year. This Board is facing more or less a \$12 million dollar deficit situation in which we are going to have to make cuts. We need to try and show the people of Dauphin County that we are responsible for their tax dollars and of course when I say we are responsible I mean the entire County organization. Again, I want to stress, because the time is going to come when the Board is going to come and ask where they can make cuts and it's better to have four or five months to figure that out than to spend two months trying to figure out where can I cut 10% because the Board just mandated that I do so. My feeling is that we will be on very high ground come the end of this year. People have been given ample warning that cuts will be made. I do believe if you are planning those cuts it's a lot better than making last minute cuts where we say, go do it.

The second issue that we're going to have to wrestle with is the fact that the Courthouse Renovation Project is going to come to a close. This Board is still trying to manage that project and get it taken care of. The bottom line is that there is going to be some money within this year's budget that is going to have to be shifted around in order to meet the demands of this project. Again, this Board will probably have to come to certain folks and say, look we realize certain things were approved for this year, are there purchases that can be put off that you were planning on making this year that maybe you can make next year in order to shift some funding so that we can ultimately get the Courthouse Renovation Project complete. I hope that folks are listening. I will continue to stress this every week because I think it is an important issue and I would much prefer Dauphin County to be down-sized in a wise and well thought out way rather than go and cut 10% just because you have to. Thank you.

Mr. Haste: Anything else?

Mr. Saylor: Mr. Chairman, based on the comments that Commissioner DiFrancesco made last week and what he made here would it be worth pursuing having a Director's Meeting once we have this information together with regard to funding of services. For example what is mandated and what is not and also the situation with the hiring. We could pass this along to them and bounce it off of them to see what their suggestions are.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I don't know if it would be appropriate or not, I really haven't given it too much thought, to put together a Blue Ribbon Panel if you will, of outsiders, business people and so forth to take a look at County government to ask what are you and aren't you doing. Where can you make changes? Obviously from an inside perspective we don't always see everything and maybe there are some very good suggestions that could be brought to the table by pulling together a group of community folks with varied

array of life experiences and a lot of different skill sets to come in and take a look. That is something we may want to consider.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Haste: We have correspondence before us items A through H to be handled by the staff.

- A. Received correspondence from ServiceNet, Inc., expressing appreciation for facilitating the training on Family Group Conferencing. (Human Services)
- B. Received correspondence from Kunkel School expressing appreciation for help and support of a student. (Mental Health/Mental Retardation)
- C. Received correspondence from the Dauphin County Housing expressing appreciation for assistance with housing for MH clients. (Mental Health/Mental Retardation)
- D. Received correspondence from an individual expressing appreciation for the Dauphin County Children & Youth Services.
- E. Notification from Pennsy Supply, Inc., indicating they plan to submit an application to DEP for a plan approval to construct, modify or reactivate an air contamination source and/or install an air cleaning device at the Hummelstown Quarry, South Hanover Twp., Dauphin County.
- F. Notification from Light-Heigel & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Middle Paxton Township, indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP for necessary waterways encroachment permits for replacement of a culvert at the intersection of Denison Road and Stoney Creek Road in Middle Paxton Township, Dauphin County.
- G. Notification from Light-Heigel & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Morgan Brothers Construction, indicating they intend to submit an application for a PADOT Highway Occupancy permit for utility installation and possible encroachment in Lower Swatara Township, Dauphin County.
- H. Notification from Light-Heigel & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Jackson Township, indicating they intend to submit an application for a PADEP General Permit for firefighting water intakes in Armstrong Creek and its tributaries at Rettinger Road, Creek Road, Wolf Hole Road, and Dietrick Road.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(There was no public participation.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. Mr. Haste—Aye. Mr. DiFrancesco—Aye. Mr. Hartwick—Aye. Motion carries.

Transcribed by: Jena Wolgemuth
March 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

printed 6/29/04