



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Commissioners' Legislative Meeting

Wednesday, August 2, 2006 (10:00am)

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Gary Serhan, Controller's Office; Tom Guenther, IT Director; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; Leila McAdoo, Solicitor's Office; Bob Hawley, Court Administrator's Office; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Sharon Way, Personnel; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Jerry Wood, CID; Bruce Foreman, Solicitor's Office; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Julia Nace, Assistance Chief Clerk; George Connor, DCED; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office, Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office and Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office.

GUESTS PRESENT

Evelyn Hurst and Jack Sherzer

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: We have four sets of meeting minutes. We have the Legislative Meeting minutes from June 28, 2006 and the Workshop Meeting minutes from July 12, 2006. Is there a motion to approve?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve the Legislative Meeting minutes from June 28, 2006 and the Workshop Meeting minutes from July 12, 2006. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Haste: We now have the June 28, 2006 and the July 12, 2006 Salary Board Meeting minutes. The Salary Board consists of the three Commissioners and the Controller. Is there a motion to approve?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Ms. Rebeck to approve the June 28, 2006 and the July 12, 2006 Salary Board Meeting minutes. All were in favor. Motion carries.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners as you know we met thrice in Executive Session. The first time was on the 20th of July 2006, where we discussed some labor and real estate issues. Previous to that we met on July 19, 2006 to review some litigation and we met this morning in Executive Session to review some labor issues. That is all I have.

Mr. Haste: Thank you.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Jerry Wood, C. I. D.

1. Adopt Resolution No. 16-2006 - Sobriety Checkpoint Grant Renewal.

Mr. Wood: Good morning. Thank you for giving me a few minutes. Our grant has been renewed by PENNDOT in the amount of \$32,000 and change, which is the exact same amount as last year. Mr. Saylor had suggested that perhaps I put on a quick presentation for you. That is all I am really going to be doing today.

I know that Mr. Haste and Mr. DiFrancesco have ridden with us on a couple occasions and maybe they will have some comments afterwards. I think they were pleasantly surprised, or not, but surprised nevertheless to see what we are doing out there.

The first grant was actually written by Mr. Tully in 1993. I was hired as the coordinator and we began operations the following year. We have been doing these for 12 years and over that period of time the county has been awarded half a million dollars, or more, in highway safety funds.

The National Highway and Transportation Safety Act (NHTSA) provides the funds to the states and PENNDOT in turn distributes them to the projects. In 1993 we were one of the original 12 projects. Today we are 1 of 45 that operate throughout Pennsylvania. Some are large, some are small and that includes one operated by the State Police alone. That is a Commonwealth wide venture. Over that time we have conducted 50 checkpoints and arrested in excess of 500 offenders. We've only had one court challenge and by that I mean we have only had one constitutional challenge and that was in 1994 or 1995, it was defeated by Judge Hoover and we haven't had a problem since. PENNDOT actually considers us a model for some of the other programs in Pennsylvania. We have distributed our SOP's throughout those agencies.

We have had some honor in being asked to direct some pilot projects, one at the Fish and Boat Commission on the river a few years ago where we operate on the concept that if someone is BUI on the river they will eventually be DUI on the highway with the added affects of the wind, rain and so forth. We participated in a NHTSA project six years ago where we operated some type of highway safety or underage drinking operation every week for 15 months. Some of the states, Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, California, Maryland and I think Ohio participated and we were one of 15 projects selected by NHTSA for this by the state. In 2005 we became part of a South Central Regional program with Dauphin, Cumberland, Lebanon, Lancaster, Adams and York counties. The theory behind that is we all, especially in the capital region are so closely tied together with Cumberland County being directly across the river, as is York, a lot of people run back and forth and we for instance; have conducted check points where they have gone through two and three check-points in one evening, having gone from one county to the next. As a region we have done 19 operations, contacted 3600 motorists and if you think about that in terms of numbers it is probably going to be much larger because those 3600 motorists are going to tell 2-3 people so it is going to grow exponentially. There were 95 DUI arrests throughout the region.

Mr. Haste: In what time frame?

Mr. Wood: Within the last year.

Mr. Haste: Okay.

Mr. Wood: We were funded for two roving patrols. The one on October 21, 2005, there were 67 total arrests made throughout the region and we made 33 of those here in the City.

Downtown has become quite the place for you might say sharks in a pond. We are out there fairly regularly on these funded projects and we are all the time arresting 15-16 people as a regular. I know when Mr. Haste was with us and Mr. DiFrancesco last spring, we arrested a lot of people, I think it was 10-11 that night. There are three components, sobriety checkpoints, the roving patrols, which I have alluded to, and cops in shops.

Last year we conducted 4 checkpoint operations, contacted over 2,000 motorists, again multiply that by 4 at least, we arrested 35 offenders and made over 150 other arrests. When I say that it is warrant service traffic arrests, felony arrests, drug arrests and we confiscated some firearms. Things like that.

We have done the roving patrols again, we did 8 of those, contacted 600 motorists, made 75 arrests and made 350 other arrests in those operations. Clearly NHTSA likes us to do the checkpoints more than the rovers. Obviously they are sexier, for lack of a better word. There are a lot of lights, flash and you contact more people, but we are of the opinion that the rovers are actually more successful as far as real time spent.

In cops in shops, undercover police officers work in a licensed establishment. Generally it isn't a bar, we haven't had a lot of success at the bars, but it is beverage distributors and State liquor stores have been directed by the Governor's Office to participate whether they want to or not. We will put an undercover in there. He may be working stacking boxes. He or she doesn't handle money, but they work in there much like an employee or a customer and if they see an underage person come in they will confront them. Or if they see an of-age person come in and it looks like there is someone outside that they are buying alcohol for they will confront them on the outside. Some times they get arrested, some times they don't. In the interest of safety we always have a uniformed officer somewhere close by assigned to the detail for traffic stops in case someone bugs out. We did three operations last year. Lower Paxton and Derry Townships are the two police agencies that are participating in this. They are highly successful. We target underage drinkers or the young adult drinker from 20-35 who, clearly 20 years old is underage, but we are concerned about people buying alcohol for younger people.

We have the Harrisburg Police, Lower Paxton, Swatara, Derry, Susquehanna and of course the State Police run their own operation, but they also work in concert with us on a regular basis. As do Dauphin County agencies, the Sheriff, Probation and Parole, of course my office and the District Attorney himself.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving are a regular presence. They like to come and give us support. Now I understand in other counties they will come and provide a delicacy called checkpoint chowder. I have gotten to sample that, but that is a York County

delicacy. Salvation Army comes in and provides us services of their canteen, coffee and hot dogs for the officers. PENNDOT will of course show up and we will get some help from some of the fire departments that are around for lighting and so forth.

The last several checkpoints that we have done have been in the City at Front and Paxton Street. We find that to be highly successful with the downtown growth a lot of people come from out of the region. People come from as far as State College, Lancaster, Philadelphia in some cases, Gettysburg, they only know one way in and one way out and that seems to be the best and safest place for us to do it. Safety is a big concern of ours. I appreciate your time. If you have any questions or comments I would be glad to field any of those for you.

I think you are very familiar with the program. Again, I want to extend to any of you, or all of you, to come and ride along with us. It is not a secret operation. Anyone that wants to ride along, please let me know.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I want to add a comment. The night that I was out was on a roving patrol. The patrol was very effective because I don't recall whether there were 5 or 6 cars out on the street that night.

Mr. Woods: There were 5 or 6 two-man cars.

Mr. DiFrancesco: They have the DUI detail stickers on the cars. Just the presence and visibility on the Second St. corridor makes all the difference in the world. There were still a lot of people having a great time, but they knew that they had to be responsible when they had that great time. Aside from the strict enforcement of the DUI rules, obviously there were other things taking place in downtown where people were just driving crazy through crowded streets and so forth. It is important to have the strong commerce, but you are only going to have that if people feel it is safe. That was the side benefit of having a strong police presence and the detail. It was a great night. I learned a lot that night. I look forward to being on the first check point as well because I have not been to one yet.

Mr. Woods: Our funding is almost out for the current project. We have about enough left for a good size roving patrol. NHTSA has a drive going between the middle of this month and the middle of next month to overlap the Labor Day holiday. We will participate in that. Then our new money will kick in whenever. I expect it to ratify today and then whenever PENNDOT turns it around and sends it back, hopefully by the end of September. It is interesting to see how many people hail the Harrisburg Police cars as cabs. I don't know if you noticed it that night. We are glad to give them a ride, you understand, but it's not always where they want to go. Thank you very much.

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners the paperwork for the grant is included in the packet for signature today. I think we need to have a vote on this particular application because it is not included in the Items for Approval.

Mr. Tully: Renewal of the grant.

Mr. Haste: So that is Resolution #16 of 2006? That is what is listed on the agenda.

Mr. Saylor: Yes, that would be.

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to adopt Resolution #16-2006 the Sobriety Checkpoint Renewal Grant. All were in favor. Motion carries.

- B. Sandy Moore, Human Services Director/Children & Youth Agency
 - 1. Children & Youth Services and Juvenile Justice Services FY07/08 Needs Based Plan.

Ms. Moore: Good morning Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to talk about the Needs Based Plan and Budget. As you know the Children and Youth office is required to submit a Needs Based Plan and Budget every year. We actually plan for two years in the budget that we submit to the Department of Public Welfare, the Office of Children Youth and Families. We submit for the current year that we are in, which is called the implementation year and we submit for the needs based year, which is a year out. Basically what we are doing in that needs based year is sort of giving the department a heads up on what changes we think we will be implementing within the Children and Youth budget and what budget needs we may have for their planning process. Lots of folks are involved in this whole process. We gather information throughout the year, obviously from all of you and from our staff, from our Judges, from our Juvenile Probation Department, all of our providers, we have parents and community members, our clergy is pretty involved with our system of care process and our advisory boards throughout the county.

The Needs Based Plan as you know is the program and fiscal outline for Children and Youth. It includes all of the administration for Children and Youth, all of the placement and programming for Children and Youth and it includes the placement and prevention programs for our Juvenile Probation system. I'll talk to you about the years it covers. It really is the connection between the services that the county delivers and the state and federal mandates. This year there was a requirement to include the BARJ principals of accountability, competency development and community safety, which our Juvenile Probation Department does. The Needs Based Plan is due to the Department of Public Welfare by August 15, 2006, which is why it is being asked for a vote today and couldn't get on the Workshop and the next Legislative Meeting because that would have been the 16th. My biggest concern is if for any reason our tentative numbers for 2007 and 2008 come in at a level that we don't want them to come in and we have to appeal, I want to make sure that this plan got into the Department on time so that there isn't a technicality around any appeal that we might have to make.

We had to pick at least four outcomes or actually at least three outcomes to focus on in our Needs Based Plan. For Children and Youth when you look at our numbers, stability

of care, re-entry and adoption were the areas that we wanted to focus on the most. They are the same areas that we have focused on for the last couple of years. We think we need to continue focusing on them even though our adoption numbers are pretty positive. We built in the competency development component for Juvenile Probation. We also throughout the plan, which is a fairly thick document and I did not make copies for all of you because it is a couple of inches, we had to build into our plan our system of care services and principles, which as you all know we have a thorough system of care grant that we've talked about in the past. So I am not going to go through those.

We also had to identify systemic issues that we think need to be addressed within our plan. Again, these are federal issues from the Office of Children and Families for when the federal government comes in, I believe it is next year, to once again audit Pennsylvania they will be picking three counties. Philadelphia will be one of those because it is the largest in the state. They have not yet identified the other two. When they come in they look at these areas and rate counties on these areas.

We found a lot of data that goes into our Needs Based Plan. Another reason the plan comes a little bit late this year is because the state contracts with a group called Hornby Zeller who needs to compile data statewide and for each of the counties. The data template that they sent us first was missing data and then came to us a little bit late. Their data usually isn't as accurate as our internal data so we have to then blend what they say our data looks like and what we think our data looks like. Ours is usually more accurate.

Just some statistics, Pennsylvania's numbers for 2005, how many suspected child abuse reports there were and how many of those were substantiated, which shows a decrease in the substantiated reports. For Dauphin County specifically we had 535 reports of suspected abuse and neglect, 89 were substantiated, 13 of those were substantiated as re-abuse according to the state, Hornby Zellers numbers. Again this is one of those instances where their numbers don't necessarily jive with our numbers. Because the number is so low, we go back and pull every case and take a look at what it is calling re-substantiated. I actually have the specifics on them. Basically what happens is any new report that is filed with Childline as an abuse, once a child comes into our system is counted as a re-abuse. There were three of those reports, but thirteen substantiated re-abuse means there were that many children involved in those three reports. What we found on each of those reports is that the children came into care at a later date and time. They shared additional allegations of things that had happened to them prior to coming in to care. We had to file those with Childline. Childline just reports those as re-abuses even though the children weren't re-abused. It was more information that children got into a safe place and felt comfortable disclosing. In actuality we had zero re-abuses in Dauphin County. Historically we had zero re-abuses and that is just how the state counts them versus how we count them. Does that make sense?

Mr. Haste: How does that 535 compare to 2004?

Ms. Moore: It is nearly the same. I don't have the exact numbers. It wasn't too huge a spike at all in the reports that we got.

Mr. Haste: It did go up though?

Ms. Moore: Slightly, but it wasn't significant.

Mr. Haste: The reason I ask is because on the previous slide there was a point made by the state that it went down.

Ms. Moore: Ours did not go down. So again zero change on where we were at on re-abuse. What these next slides show are what the federal government standards are and then what Dauphin County looks like. In parenthesis at the end of each of these bullets is what the federal government standard is. Obviously the bullet states what ours are. The couple areas that concern us are first, the re-entry into care within 12 months. You can see the federal government says that should not be more than 8.6% of the children that you are serving. For Children and Youth it is 18% and for Juvenile Probation it is 44%. Again, we think that is how numbers are counted. We are dissecting that a little bit. We think when children go for Juvenile Probation for example; when children go into the Schaffner Center and are released at detention or at an A&D hearing on electronic monitoring that Schaffner placement is counted as a placement by the State and by the federal government. When they then go to court and the Judge orders a placement facility for them that is a re-entry into care. Even though having them release that electronic monitoring is a good thing it's still seen as a re-entry into care. Does that make sense?

Mr. DiFrancesco: So if they had not gone on electronic monitor, had they stayed in Schaffner and then just went on to another facility....

Ms. Moore: It would have been one entry into care. Correct.

Sometimes good practice does not always transfer into good numbers for the county. We address that in our Needs Based Plan. We say to them that is part of what we think is happening. The other thing for Children and Youth that we have identified.

Mr. Haste: I think a good way to compare it is just looking at the numbers. That is our own standard instead of their standard. For instance, JPO was 78% in 2002 and down to 44% this year. That indicates to me that we are headed in the right direction.

Ms. Moore: Yes, you are right.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The question I was going to ask is, you take the state's data and then break it down even further so you can give us a better read on what the real picture is?

Ms. Moore: Correct. We have to give the state a better read because we have to come up with, not really corrective actions, but things that we are going to try to do to impact these numbers.

One of the things that we did look at for Children and Youth, re-entry rates, what we were noticing is that particularly young females who came out of group home care were coming back into care. We would release them from group home, they would go back home where things weren't stabilizing and they would end up back in care. If you are talking about a 16 or 17 year old girl who had been in several group homes who has some emotional issues, we are seeing that as a population that was coming back in. One of the things that we have asked for are in our needs based year of 2007 is some additional state funding to expand the multi-systemic group therapy program specifically targeting 16 and 17 year old young women. We have also asked for additional money for our mentoring program through Youth for Christ and want them to connect mentors with these young girls. That is if the state gives us money is when we will do those things. That is how we tie these numbers to the program planning that we are doing.

You can see children in care for less than 12 months. This is actually a fairly good statistic. We try to get children reunited as quickly and safely as possible. Part of the question is, is that a reason that kids are coming back into care so quickly, that they are going home too quickly and then they are coming back in? We have gone back and looked at cases and we don't think that is what is happening. We think it has more to do with the other issues that I have presented.

Then we look at children reunified with parents, the feds look at did they do so within a 12 month period. You see there that the standard is 76.2%. Both in Children and Youth and Juvenile Probation it happens in more of our cases than not. We are actually doing better than the federal standard. The next one I am particularly proud of because several years ago we weren't anywhere close to this number and that is the number of children who were adopted that left care within 24 months. The federal standard is 32% of those children adopted need to have that adoption occur within 24 months. For us it is almost 35% at this point. I think a couple years ago our numbers weren't as great also because we had a lot of children who had been in foster care for many years. Our adoption numbers were up, we were adopting a lot of children, but those were children who were 13, 14 and 15 year olds who had been in care much longer than 24 months. The feds don't look at how many children get adopted out of your system. They look at how quickly those children get adopted out of your system. Probably a lot of those older children have already been adopted out of our system.

Then there is looking at how many children who are under the age of 12 in group homes or institutions. Children and Youth have no children under, I'm sorry, that's probably 1 child within Children and Youth, but most of those children are in Juvenile Probation. Those children are probably 11 years old because 10 year olds come into the Children and Youth system. 11 and 12 year olds that are going through the Juvenile Probation system, if they are in placement they are probably going to be placed in a group home

or in an institution and they probably have done some fairly serious things even at that very young age.

The next few slides show you historical data from 2002 down to 2006 so you can sort of see the trends of where we are going. I am just going to flip through those. Again this is the data that makes us identify what those different focus areas are and what our program planning is and what type of additional funding we ask for from the state. Even though our adoption numbers have gone dramatically in the right direction we still think adoption work is pretty critical so we built that in as one of our objectives.

What we are planning on doing, and what this 2" document says, is that we are looking at continuing the work that we are doing related to family group conferencing, fully implementing our system of care federal grant initiative and increasing the availability of our licensed foster care homes. We started that several years ago when the Board allowed us to have an additional position specifically to do recruitment. I can say that our numbers in foster care have significantly increased. Part of that is the recruitment and the other part is because of the implementation of kinship licensed foster care. Kinship providers who are familiar with children coming in to care actually go through the licensing process. We do everything that needs to happen to become licensed foster homes. Eventually, hopefully, those children will either go back home to their birth family safely or the kin will adopt them. My hope is that some of those kinship families will have a very positive experience being foster families and will, once their kin leaves, will continue and stay on as foster parents for us.

Mr. Haste: Has that happened?

Ms. Moore: Not yet.

The other piece that we have asked the state for additional funds on is to create specialized shelter foster homes. This really came out of the fairly recent phenomenon of having the Schaffner Detention Center overflowing with children. What we say was a lot of children were going into the shelter portion, which required Juvenile Probation to move some of their children to other counties detention facilities. What we looked at is could some of the children through the Children and Youth agency go into specially trained foster homes instead of the Schaffner shelter. We think some could, but we think those foster parents would need some very specific training around trauma and transitioning. We have pulled together a group of about 5 of our current licensed foster homes who are interested in doing this and are looking at what type of additional supports they will need to be able to bring children directly to their home and then help them transition on to a more permanent home.

I throw in the idea of the more eyes, hands and ears and everything that is involved with children the safer we think they are. That really is the overall philosophy that we blended in to our needs based plan. We think involving the community, parents, our faith community, everybody it is going to make children safer ultimately, especially when we step out of their lives.

We had to report to the state how many current vacancies we have. These are primarily casework vacancies, some of it has to do with our system of care initiative and the feds requiring us to add some positions. A lot of it has to do with the civil service process and how long it takes and how complicated it is to get qualified applicants through that whole process. However, we did also put in our plan that all of those vacancies will be filled because last year what happened...and we plan to fill them all, but last year when counties did not put those kinds of statements in the state came back and deleted positions from counties and removed funds from counties. We wanted to make it real clear that was not our intention and we were going to fill those.

We also added, even though this wasn't put in the needs based requirement, we added the requirements that were put on as asked by the federal government and our system of care grant. They actually required us to pull Helen Spence from Juvenile Probation who is actually carrying some Juvenile Probation cases, make her a full-time Community liaison. The feds told us she could not carry any cases. That is a change that has recently happened. Her salary is paid through the system of care grant. They also told us that we needed to have clerical support and that we needed to have a Director for the grant. Those things have already happened. We also built into the grant funding that we wanted to have two paid part-time parents to help review policies, procedures and help us make our services much more parent friendly. These are positions that you all approved a year and a half ago. Those are the only positions that we told the state that we were still trying to form.

Some of the things that we are not aware of yet are the continued impact of TANF and what will happen when TANF goes away. We have some concerns about the medical assistant realignment dollars that the state has pulled out of our budget. This year it is about \$3.2 million. We don't think we will come close to \$3.2 million but the state has also built in additional Act 148 dollars to our budget in case we don't hit our MA target. We are thinking that will be enough. It is close to a million dollars.

We also have some concerns as you might know about the IV-E disallowance. The federal governments debate right now with Pennsylvania and where those funds are happening and the certified numbers, which is a letter that I just got, actually Commissioner Haste you got and then forwarded on to me. Take into account that there is a 21% decrease in our admin IV-E dollars and that was built into our budget. I have to say that the certified numbers that I just got I did look at compared to our needs base and they look like they are going to cover us. It doesn't look like there are additional county general fund expectations. We told the state there basically are no more county general fund dollars. I think we are going to be okay. Sandy Pintarch is on vacation this week so I need her to look at all the details of the numbers, but it looks okay at this point.

In 2007/2008 the only additional staff we are asking the state for funds for are two Quality Assurance Program Specialists. The state has basically said that if there are future disallowances by the federal government based on how we claim their IV-E that

counties will be held responsible to pay back those funds. The counties response to that is they are following the directives of the state and doing exactly what the state asks us to do in their instructions so the county should not be held responsible for doing what the state asks them to do. That leads to a disallowance. Many counties are building in quality assurance positions and saying to the state we need people to be the check and balance to make sure that we are asking for the funds in a way that we need to be asking for the funds. I'm not certain that they will give us additional funds to do this, but thought that we could at least ask them for it. If they deny it we can say we asked you for assistance in making sure we were doing what we needed to be doing.

The other focus that we have as you know the county used to get a family service system reform grant that paid for all the work that Ramona Thompson is doing, the fatherhood initiative and the outcomes initiative. The state asked us to blend that into our Children and Youth budget because the FSSR dollars are all gone. We have built that in and we asked for expansion money specifically for our fatherhood initiative, about \$40,000. We asked for additional funds in 2007/2008 for our mentorship program to expand, as I said earlier, to those 16 and 17 year old young women and additional money for our multi-systemic therapy. We asked for some funds to do partial integrated system for data across human service boundaries, mental health, drug and alcohol, and the CMU. We are trying to get together to share information if we can, just Children and Youth's piece of it. We asked for money to do a truancy project specifically beginning at targeting Harrisburg schools. That is where the biggest truancy numbers are coming from. State required the county to do something related to truancy. It doesn't say what you have to do, but it says you have to do something. So we asked them for money to do a pilot project and then more money for parent and family involvement. Then if we don't get this money we simply don't do the additional pieces.

I already talked about most of this, the kinship care, the expansion of family group in our system of care. We want to increase our use of SWAN services, which are the statewide adoption network services, specifically for any older children that we have in care. We do still have a few that we are looking for placements for. We just matched a 15 year old with a family.

Mr. Haste: Has that added to your success in getting those folks adopted within the 24 months?

Ms. Moore: Yes. If we have older children, once those children get adopted, it actually goes against in the number, because those children have probably been in care longer than 24 months. If they have been in care for three years the fact that they got adopted really isn't seen as or counted as a positive, it's actually counted as a negative for us in our numbers because it was more than 24 months that they were in care. Obviously, we think it was a good thing that they got adopted.

The other thing was increasing our focus on outcome assessment, evaluation and program improvement. We have some money built-in asking specifically for some consultation around outcomes. One of the new things in the needs based this year is

that the state required for every intervention or prevention program that we had we had to identify what outcomes those programs were tracking and what outcomes they had to date, which we have. If you are interested in any other prevention programs it will show what they are tracking and how they are doing. All of our programs are doing really well. The only one that struggled a little bit, and we will be giving them some assistance in future years, is the Halifax teen center. Because it is a drop-in center they serve lots and lots of children, but it is really hard to track when you don't have the same kids coming in. What we were able to do was to look at the arrest rates that were happening in Halifax for teens compared to before the Halifax center opened and after. They have significantly decreased. You can't completely tie that to the Halifax teen center, but we at least gave that statistic to the state.

Here is our budget, it shows the estimated actuals for this year, what our implementation year request was, the county share connected to that and what our needs based year would be and the county cost for that if they give us additional funds.

I also want to point out that there is an assurance of compliance form that needs to be signed by the three County Commissioners, usually the delinquency independency judge, although we included the President Judge since Judge Lewis does some delinquency hearings, the Juvenile Probation Chief and the Mental Health/Mental Retardation Director. Everybody has signed off on those forms. I wanted to bring to your attention that our form looks a little different than what the state sent us. The state sent us a blanket form that just asked the commissioners to commit to the county share. We put in some additional language saying that we would only commit to the county's share if the state and federal funds came along with it. What we didn't want them to do was say that you committed to the state share and we are not going to give you all the state and federal dollars but you still need to put in your share. We changed that and we also put in wording that we would only commit to the outcomes that we identified here if the state and federal dollars come to allow us to do what it is that we needed to do. The last thing that we put in was a new portion from the state is related to the IV-E disallowance. The state's comment in here was that the county would be responsible to pay back any IV-E disallowance. We added language that said if we made uncorrected errors or if we didn't follow the states instructions, then we would be liable, but otherwise we are not. So we changed a little bit of the wording and we bolded it so that the state would be aware of what it was that we changed for your signature.

I think the last thing that I wanted to share was that this plan really is a continuation of what we have done in the past. We didn't build in a lot of additional money for additional placements. We are hoping that we can maintain placements at the level that they are or reduce them. A huge portion of that, and he's not here I wish he were, but is the result of Steve Suknaic and the Juvenile Probation Department. You know as they place in group homes, institutions and secured theirs are the most costly of placements and they have done a phenomenal job of actually reducing the number of placements that they have. They have done an incredible job in reducing the amount of secure placements which are by far the most restrictive and the most costly placements. That actually started a couple years ago in a conversation with Judge Lewis and Steve and a

new process that was developed within the Juvenile Probation Department to keep those recommendations to a minimum. At one point we had approximately 30 youth in secure placements. This year we have averaged around 3. That is a huge savings to the Children and Youth Budget. I think the other pieces, the electronic monitoring that they took over, moving children more quickly out of Schaffner and back into the community safely and finding appropriate placements for them. They have been very involved in our Medical Assistance realignment dollars and doing what they can to get children placed into facilities that are MA approved. Publicly I wanted to thank Steve and his department and the Judges for helping us control costs within our budget. Are there any questions?

Mr. Hartwick: Just a couple of comments. I think everybody saw the email with the hopeful additional federal grant from Senator Santorum. It appears that we are on track to receive another \$200,000 federal appropriation for our family group conferencing. This is good news.

The other one is just strictly for the update of the Board. I know you met with Mike Yohe and I know you met with Dan Eisenhower related to the CBHMP and the potential of us playing a pivotal role which presents an opportunity for additional revenue to the county. If you could in just a brief summary, I don't know if I ever had the opportunity to talk to them about that. It may be a good opportunity to give them a quick update on that piece.

Ms. Moore: I know I sent an email to all three of the Commissioners explaining that we did look at IV-E and maybe pulling down IV-E dollars for our shelter at Schaffner. There were some staffing issues that needed to be addressed and need to be addressed regardless and Dan will be talking with Commissioner DiFrancesco about that. The bottom line of all of it is this year we will probably save money by doing IV-E, but we would save state dollars and take on the audit risk for the county.

Mr. Hartwick: That's not what I'm speaking of. I was thinking about us playing a fiduciary role with the managed care agency to allow us to...instead of that organization who for \$3.5 million a year they hold the license. We'd like to see the county step in because that may be an opportunity to...

Ms. Moore: Oh you are talking about the HAFPA contract.

Mr. Hartwick: That is correct.

Ms. Moore: That is under the MH/MR administration and looking at right now you know HAFPA receives approximately \$3.5 million to basically give us a license to be the liability for MH/MR. They do it for 5 counties. The 5 counties I saw the Board for CABHC were looking at the possibility of having a local bank take over that responsibility. The bank is having a difficult time understanding what the arrangement would be. CABHC Board decided they need us to look at what additional collateral could we potentially put up with the bank. One of the possibilities is having the counties take on some of that for themselves and receive a fee for doing that. There literally, I know you said briefly, but

it's very difficult to explain briefly, but with all of the funds that have been collected through CABHC and the contingency funds that we have there is literally a 0% risk to the bank or to a county to take on that additional risk. They call it risk because you have to call it risk, but it really doesn't exist because there are several contingency funds you have to go through before you ever get to the risk account. Before you ever got there we would turn the program back over to the state if it was going down that quickly. There really isn't a risk. We are exploring the possibility of Dauphin County taking on its own risk and receiving a fee for that to the General Fund. I think I sent an email regarding this too; it would be about \$95,000 if we chose to go that way.

CABHC is still in communication with Lebanon Bank to find out what they are going to be doing.

Mr. Hartwick: One last question, this one will be easier.

Ms. Moore: Thank you.

Mr. Hartwick: Last night I ran into a 5 year old kid at Turkey Hill who appeared to be in position to being abused. He was barefoot, no money and I was trying to reach a caseworker or someone. I tried to contact all the numbers. Could you just for myself and the Board, if we ever run into a situation like that again, is there a night time number that you can contact with Children and Youth?

Ms. Moore: There is. Actually what I did this morning Commissioner is I contacted Kacey and gave her the number and asked her to put it into your cell phone, my home number and Karen's home number. In case you can't ever get us on the cell, that will hopefully be in your cell phone. The number is 717-780-7200. That is our main switchboard. It automatically switches over to an after-hours service and you should be able to get our caseworker. Sometimes our caseworker is out in the field or in an area where the cell phone won't work, then you certainly can call me. If you don't reach me on my cell phone I'm probably in the house someplace and my cell phone is in a different room.

Mr. Hartwick: Thanks.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Slightly shifting gears, you already mentioned about JPO's part in the overall plan. Obviously the Board has been hit once again with the fact that Title IV-E was cut on the JPO side. Last year we increased the staff complement out there by 6 JPO's. This was done based on the Title IV-E money that was going to offset those costs. Now that those costs have basically been eliminated and now we are talking about a situation in order to fund those 6 positions on an on-going basis that will require some general fund dollars. The question I have for you is, I know the statistical trend has improved, but can you give me your thoughts on how important those 6 positions are to the whole Children and Youth picture? Have you seen real benefits, for instance, in having a JPO officer in a particular high school rather than split between two schools

and the more intense attention that can be given when caseloads are lower? Can you speak to that at all? Do you see how important that is to the overall picture?

Ms. Moore: I may have talked with Commissioner Hartwick about this privately and my belief is that the lower the caseloads the more opportunity for the JPO's to be in there actually monitoring what's going on and to provide services. I think there is a direct connect with that with the reduction of placements. What I saw when I came in as the Administrator 6 years ago was that JPO numbers were going up and they were constantly climbing. Last year we leveled them off. This year they have actually decreased in terms of placements. That is pretty phenomenal. That is not happening in the rest of the state. I think the more you are able to have direct contact with families and you are checking in and the kids know you are going to be checking in hopefully they are recognizing concerns and struggles that families are having before they become critical and a crisis and kids need to be in placement. My belief is there is a direct connection.

I don't know if that answers your question, but certainly JPO placements impact the Children and Youth budget dramatically both in a positive and negative way. It has impacted it in a positive way recently.

Mr. Hartwick: Most placement costs are going down in light of arrest rates continuing to rise, that is certainly a feat.

Ms. Moore: I think the other piece of taking on the electronic monitoring, we have reduced by I think it was 30% last year our use of community providers. Our JPO officers took on that added responsibility.

Mr. Haste: I think that is a good point, but I will still continue to voice concern that part of what is going on by the JPO's in the schools is they are doing work the school should be doing.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I agree with that.

Mr. Haste: I hear it. I see it. I talk to Police Officers. I talk to District Judges. I think it is a necessary evil, but the school districts are slacking in what they need to be doing. Where it is causing a problem is they are now focusing on the problem kids and the regular disciplinarian in the hallway and the lunchroom is being forgotten because they are not dealing with that anymore. That is someone else's problem. Now we have Police Officers in the schools. We have got JPO's in the schools and the schools still are not doing their job. We are focusing on the problem, but what that is allowing is chaos in bathrooms, lunchrooms and in the hallway and all you need to do is talk to a group of kids. Schools are not paying attention to discipline anymore.

Ms. Moore: Not having children in schools and not being there I can't speak to that except that I know that for us getting notification that a child or a family is struggling early is going to help us keep that child out of placement. If that means I am in the

school and I see little Johnny not coming with the right clothes and I'm talking from the child welfare perspective early, I can get in there and do some prevention rather than getting the phone call at the central Children and Youth office where now I've got to place Johnny.

Mr. Haste: The problem is and I am asking because I know you normally meet with the school administrator and I think this needs to stay on the plate. The problem is with the way this is going now all we are doing is giving fertile ground for the bully's to grow. That is exactly what is going on. Maybe they are not criminal yet, but the bullies are growing. Because the school is not paying attention it is someone else's problem the bully's are getting their way.

Ms. Moore: You are right Commissioner we meet with the Superintendents in northern Dauphin and really it was at their request and it is a very productive meeting. I would love to do it down here.

Mr. Haste: I think you know what school I am talking about in particular.

Ms. Moore: I do know and I think you are right.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I don't know if this is my fault or not because I know we talked about this subject before. If there is anything I or the Board as a whole can do to make sure that those meetings happen in southern Dauphin County we'll do our part to make sure that they happen. Discipline in the schools is going down. It is not where it was. I can speak to my home school district. Some would say the day and age has come and passed where a principal can hold kids accountable for their actions. I say that the day has not come to pass and the school has to take a stand and not be afraid of a potential law suit. We have got to reclaim the schools and right now the trend is going in the wrong direction. Having probation officers in the schools is a great thing because of the constant contact with the students but also because all of a sudden the eyes and ears are in the hallways and they know if there is a party scheduled at Suzy's house this Friday night. There is intelligence being collected too. For a lot of reasons we are better off having them there because we can check up on the kids that potentially would be at Suzy's house when they shouldn't. It's a lot harder for those kids on probation to slip and get away with things. The need for that strong level of discipline is exactly why they are on probation. Someone needs to be watching over them.

The other question I have for you and I'll really put you on the spot so I'll understand if you don't have an answer or a comment. In your opinion how close are we to a specific shelter need for Children and Youth kids? Obviously the numbers that we have been experiencing I want to call an anomaly. I want to say that it is a peak all of a sudden and we don't understand it, but hopefully it is going to go away and we will get back to normal numbers. What kind of trends are you seeing for future needs for shelter capacity?

Ms. Moore: I absolutely do not believe in creating a shelter, Commissioner. I think if you create it they come. I believe in the shelter foster care program. I think abused and neglected children, to the degree that we could possibly make it happen, should go into family homes not into a shelter. Even though Schaffner does a wonderful job with their shelter I just think Children and Youth needs to get better at finding kinship care providers and needs to find family homes and we all need to get out there and recruit and put kids who are abused and neglected into families and not into facilities. I would like not to create a shelter.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I believe the answer you just gave far outweighs any negative implications on communications that might show up in the near future. That answer was far better than what I expected to hear. Thank you, that's all I have.

Ms. Moore: Any more questions? (There were none.) Thank you.

SALARY BOARD

A full set of Salary Board minutes is on file in the Chief Clerk's office.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: I have no changes to the Personnel Packet that was presented last week.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve the Personnel Packet?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve the Personnel Packet as presented. All were in favor. Motion carries.

Mr. Haste: Before you leave there is one more item I want to bring up and that is the committee. We want to move forward with advertising for a Public Defender. We had talked about a committee who would review those applications, screen them and give the Board of Commissioners a list of 3 that are the finalists. If you could get together we need to do advertisements for that. As far as I know the 5 committee members that I was told would review this would be Mark Morrison, Royce Morris, John McNally, Bill Tully and then Bill Wenner is going to sit on the committee on behalf of the courts.

Ms. Sinner: Alright.

Mr. Haste: I would ask that when you get those you give those to Mr. Tully and he will convene the group together to review and get a list of 3 finalists to us.

Mr. DiFrancesco: One issue under Personnel, coming up probably for the Workshop, I am going to direct Steve Chiavetta to present. He has been looking to add a position with the addition of the new voting machines. I am going to direct him to put the paperwork through so we can review it. I will have him come in at the next Workshop meeting. I think you all are sort of aware what he wants to do.

Mr. Haste: That is the one we eliminated though, right?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Yes.

Mr. Haste: And we gave that money...

Mr. DiFrancesco: Well, there were a couple steps. I think we took it from a full position to a half position with Election and Warehouse sharing and then we eliminated the position. The position does not exist now and I think he is going to come in and explain to the Board why having a dedicated employee out there working on the multiple machines that we purchased is important. I just wanted to give you a heads up that would be coming.

Ms. Sinner: I have some paperwork on that. He worked with Sharon to classify that position.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think basically we will have to, once we decide what we want to do, we will have to advertise for that position as well. I know he is getting a little concerned about timing and everything.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: Commissioners there are no changes to the packet from last week. On page 6 of this packet you will notice there is still an over budget showing. That is just a matter of us doing some journal entries to correct an earlier purchase order that was mistakenly charged to a wrong code. Once those are completed there will be money there. Mike confirmed that for us; we just didn't have a chance to complete it before the packet was printed. All of the over budgets have been fixed and again there are no changes from last weeks packet. Unless you have any questions, it is there for your approval.

Mr. Haste: Any questions? (There were none.) Is there a motion to approve the purchase orders?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve the Purchase Order Packet as presented. All were in favor. Motion carries.

REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR

Report from the Office of Budget & Finance August 2, 2006

- **July 21, 2006** transferred **\$10,487,804.14** to the **Payables** account and **\$1,979,363.97** to the **Payroll** account from the County's Concentration account for checks issued that week.

- **July 28, 2006** transferred **\$3,150,136.86** to the **Payables** account from the County's Concentration account for checks issued that week. (2nd quarter Library Taxes - \$2.4 million)
- **Total Term Investments – N/A**
- **Balance today in INVEST account \$129,519.37 rate 5.200%**
- **Balance today in Community Banks investment account \$50,700,966.66 rate 5.500%** (This rate equals today's Community Banks 91-day TBill rate of 5.100% plus 40 basis points)
- **Balance today in Graystone Bank investment account \$20,291,929.86 rate 5.620%** (This rate equals last month's average 1-month LIBOR rate of 5.370% plus 25 basis points)
- **Balance today in Commerce Bank investment account \$23,147,196.83 rate 5.425%** (This rate equals today's 91-day T-Bill rate of 4.975% plus 45 basis points)
- **Balance today in Sovereign Bank investment account \$100,764.44 rate 5.396%** (This rate equals today's 1-month LIBOR rate of 5.396% plus 0 basis points)

No T.R.A.N. Line of Credit required for 2006.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners I have one item. I have been contacted by a representative of the Susquehanna Greenway. They expressed interest in coming to a meeting to give you gentlemen an update as to what they have been working on and to seek your input in terms of their plans for the future. As you may recall they are working to develop a 500 mile long greenway along both east and west shores of the Susquehanna River. I will contact them and arrange to have them come in at some future public meeting. Unless there are questions for me that is the only item I have.

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

Mr. Tully: No changes to the written report. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

Mr. Haste: We have items A through U for Board action. Are there any items that need to be pulled out separately?

Mr. DiFrancesco and Mr. Hartwick: No.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve items A though U?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to approve Matters Requiring Board Action Items A through U. All were in favor. Motion carries.

- A. Training Packet
- B. Approval of FY06/07 Per Diem Rates between Children & Youth Agency and: (per distributed list)
 - 1. United Methodist Home for Children Emergency Shelter for Youth
 - 2. United Methodist Home for Children Residential Care, Inc.
 - 3. Boy's and Girl's Club of Central Pennsylvania, Inc.
 - 4. Centre County Youth Service Bureau
 - 5. Pyramid Healthcare, Inc.
- C. Approval to waive the late fees and interest due on the Hotel Tax for Cocoa Flats for the period of July 2005 through June 30, 2006.
- D. Approval to waive County taxes, County penalty, County interest and Tax Claim Costs and Fees for the Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority for several properties purchase at the June 8, 2006 Judicial Tax Sale in the amt. of \$4,521.60.
- E. Approval for refund of penalty, interest and bureau costs of the 2005 taxes to J. David Leaman on parcel #06-014-001-000-0000 in the amt. of \$86.20.
- F. Subordination Agreements with the following individuals:
 - 1. William C. Hopkins, Jr. & Connie M. Hopkins on the property located at Lot 44 A Romberger Road, Elizabethville, PA.
 - 2. Diana M. Crouse aka Diana Cobb on property located in Lower Paxton Township.
- G. State and Local Government Single Schedule Lease Purchase Agreement with Information Technology for the Dauphin County EMA Server Lease for 36 months.
- H. Contract for Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons between Dauphin County Weatherization and the PA Dept. of Community & Economic Development. The amount of the contract grant is \$642,743.00 for July 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007.
- I. Adopt Resolution No. 17-2006 authorizing \$25,000 from the Dauphin County Office of Community & Economic Development Small Business Loan Program awarded to Italian Tan & Spa, Inc., located at 4518 N. Progress Ave., Hbg.
- J. Approval of Advanced Communications Projects between the Dauphin County Community & Economic Development Office and:
 - 1. Section 108 Loan Agreement for Cameron Real Estate, L.P. in the amt. of \$1,500,000.
 - 2. Intercreditor and Subordination Agreement with Cameron Real Estate, L.P. and Commerce Bank.

- K. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY06/07 between Area Agency on Aging and:
 - 1. Capital Area Transit
 - 2. Jewish Family Service of Greater Harrisburg
- L. Adoption Assistance Agreement #2006-25.
- M. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY06/07 between Mental Health/Mental Retardation and:
 - 1. Bobbie Butch, M.S., OTR/L
 - 2. PMHCC, Inc.
 - 3. Country Meadows of Hershey
 - 4. Family Service Partners
 - 5. Leta Deatrick, t/d/b/a Central Pennsylvania Supportive Services
 - 6. Contact Helpline, Inc.
 - 7. TW Ponessa & Associates Counseling Services, Inc.
 - 8. Capital Area Intermediate Unit
 - 9. Grayson View, Inc.
 - 10. Cumberland/Perry ARC
 - 11. Nancy McCorkle
 - 12. Byron Schreck, SLP-CCC
 - 13. Masonic Village
 - 14. Grayson View, Inc.
 - 15. Portraits of Life Adult Day Services, Inc.
 - 16. Cumberland/Perry ARC
- N. State Food Purchase Program Agreement between Dauphin County Human Services Director's Office and the PA Dept. of Agriculture.
- O. Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) Agreement between Dauphin County Human Services Director's Office and the PA Dept. of Agriculture.
- P. Commissioners Approval of Automatic Rollover Services Agreement for the Deferred Compensation Program.
- Q. Children & Youth Services and Juvenile Justice Services FY07/08 Needs Based Plan.
- R. Revised Honeywell Contract for renovations at the Prison.
- S. Satisfaction Pieces for the following individuals:
 - 1. Alysia M. Wilson on property located at 7021 Chambers Hill Road, Harrisburg, PA.
 - 2. Durand C. Cargile & Mary Lee Cargile on property located at 921 Lakewood Drive, Harrisburg, PA.
 - 3. Theresa A. Strange on property located at 513 Cherrington Drive, Hbg., PA.
- T. Memorandum of Understanding between Dauphin County Community & Economic Development and the Dauphin County Planning Commission to prepare the Annual Action Plan, Subrecipient Agreement and resolve issues related to the Community & Economic Development Block Grant Program (CDBG).
- U. Approval for Rhoads & Sinon, LLP as Special Counsel for the County of Dauphin on tax issues.

FORMER BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

Mr. Haste: Any comments by the Board?

Mr. Hartwick: I just have one short comment. I want to thank Edgar Cohen for running out at the last minute yesterday to pick up those cots and help set them up at the Senior Centers. I know it was off-duty and last minute but I sincerely appreciate you and a staff person getting out there and allowing us to help keep the Senior Centers open. Also thanks to all the Human Services staff and Area Agency on Aging staff for staffing those three Senior Centers.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Haste: We have items received by the Board listed on the agenda as items A through O that will be handled by the staff appropriately.

- A. Received a letter from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc., in reference to the NBIS Bridge Inspection Report.
- B. Notification from Ridgeline Forestry & Wildlife Management, on behalf of the Peachey's Sawmill, indicating they have submitted a general permit registration form to DEP for a temporary road crossing to be constructed in Middle Paxton Township.
- C. Notification from Eastern Industries, Inc., Eastern Quarry, indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP to add a portable stone crushing plant and a portable generator.
- D. Notification from Glace Associates, Inc., on behalf of the Duncannon Borough Municipal Authority, indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP for renewal of its existing NPDES permit to discharge treated wastewater from its facility located in Perry County to the Susquehanna River in Dauphin County.
- E. Notification from Continental Placer Inc., indicating Pennsy Supply, Inc., has submitted an application to DEP, Bureau of Mining and Reclamation for a temporary increase in the volume of discharge permitted. The temporary increase is to allow for the pumping of the quarry pit which flooded on or around June 2, 2006 by water from the Swatara Creek.
- F. Notification from Alpha Consulting Engineers, Inc., on behalf of the Living Water Community Church, indicating they intend to apply to DEP for a BDWM General Permit for utility line stream crossing north of Oakleigh Drive & West of 40th St.,

Harrisburg, Swatara Township.

- G. Notification from Light-Heigel & Associates, Inc. indicating that Hershey Golf Club will be applying to PennDOT for a low volume highway occupancy permit at 1000 East Derry Road, Derry Township.
- H. Notification from Buchart Horn, Inc., on behalf of Derry Township, indicating they intend to apply to DEP for a General permit-5: utility line stream crossing for the replacement of the sanitary sewer main line along Hershey Park Drive.
- I. Notification from Hoover Engineering Services, Inc., indicating that Harry and Sherry Ramage intend to apply to DEP for a NPDES permit for stormwater discharges with the subdivision of a 4.11 acre tract into two single family home sites located in Middle Paxton Township.
- J. Notification from Advantage Engineering indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP for a general permit for a minor road crossing for a single family residential development in Lower Paxton Township.
- K. Notification from Hoover Engineering Services, Inc. indicating that the Vision Group Ventures intend to apply to DEP for a NPDES permit for stormwater discharges from construction sites located at Front Street, Susquehanna Township.
- L. Notification from Dawood Associates, Inc., on behalf of Wildwood Drive Hotel, indicating they intend to apply to the Dauphin County Conservation District for an NPDES permit for a project that includes the construction of a 124-room hotel with related parking facilities and utilities located at the southern quadrant of the intersection of Wildwood Drive and Industrial Drive, City of Harrisburg, Dauphin County.
- M. Received a letter from U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) indicating the project's Site Selection Board is studying an area located on Verbeke Street, bound by N. 6th St., Herr St., and Capital Street as a proposed site for the new United States Courthouse in Harrisburg.
- N. Received a letter from the U. S. General Services Administration (GSA) indicating they have prepared a final Environmental Assessment with the National Environmental Policy to analyze the potential impacts from the construction of the proposed U. S. Courthouse in Harrisburg.
- O. Notification from Raudenbush Engineering, Inc., on behalf of Arcadia Development Corporation, indicating they intend to use a water quality management Part II permit for the Federal Express Quarry Road, Harrisburg. The facility is located at 1400 Quarry Road, northwest of Eisenhower Blvd. The project will include replacement of the existing asphalt pavement and subbase, installation of a rock lined drainage swale, and installation of water quality inlets.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor
Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

Transcribed by: J. Wolgemuth

printed 10/09/06