



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
LEGISLATIVE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, August 25, 2004
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Diane McNaughton, Communications, Marie Rebeck, Controller, Bob Dick, Treasurer, Gary Serhan, Controller's Office, Garry Esworthy, Risk Management, Dave Schreiber, Personnel, Sharon Way, Personnel, Randy Baratucci, Purchasing, Edgar Cohen, Facilities Maintenance, Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners, Richie Martz, Commissioners, Kacey Truax, Commissioners, Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk, Julia Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk, Bill Tully, Solicitor, Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitors Office, Mike Yohe, Budget, Kay Sinner, Personnel, Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator, Bob Knupp, Solicitor, Mike Pries, Safety and Security, Steve Chiavetta, Director of Registration and Elections, Steve Howe, Director of Tax Assessment, Bruce Foreman, Solicitor, Noel Folk, Special Projects Coordinator, Skip Memmi, Community and Economic Development, Dan Kern, Schaffner

GUESTS PRESENT

Claire Jones, NAACP, Bob Grubic, Joe Schied,

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 minutes from the August 4, 2004, Workshop Meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

Mr. Hartwick: So moved.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Second.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor: We met twice in executive session, on August 16 and August 18 regarding litigation, labor negotiations and real estate issues.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board?

Ms. Jones: My name is Claire Jones, I am the current President of the Harrisburg Area NAACP and this is my first time in the Commissioners' Chambers since the three of you came on Board. This is not an indication of a lack of faith in you, in fact you are three of the people that I do not have to keep close track of. So that is why the visit comes at this time. I come this morning because I am in the process of looking at whether government entities have plans in place that relate to minorities. Do they have diversity or affirmative action plans? I did not find one for Dauphin County so I do not know what that means. If your research indicates that there is not a plan that looks at diversity of Dauphin County and how we integrate it into the government system, I would like to start a dialogue of that on behalf of the NAACP. We are also concerned this year with vendors and making sure that when the government does purchases that African American, Hispanic and Asian communities that have services to offer are included. I am not sure if there is a plan in place, a diversity plan, that that is being done and this can be monitored and I urge you that we look at that. One of the areas that seem to be an obvious one is that when we are building sites for our district justice offices is that many of the smaller contractors which are African American would have the capacity to do that. I hope that those things would be looked at. I want to tell you that I have not been here, but have been monitoring and you got good marks. You are innovative, intelligent and approachable and I hope that continues in Dauphin County. I wish you all well and of course that the NAACP is available for any input that you might want from us. Keep up the good work.

Mr. Hartwick: A lot of those issues are ones that I have discovered since I have been placed in this position by you and others. Since 1986 Dauphin County has not had an affirmative action plan and it is important that we do address those issues because we are a recipient of federal funds and that we have the accurate statistics and compile a plan that is consistent with what federal regulations require us to do. We have convened a committee of African Americans, women, men and Latino Americans within Dauphin County that look at hiring and promotional practices that exist within county government and we discussed minority vendors and contractors as well. As a matter of fact, we have already went as far as to sending RFP's out to minority contractors in the African American Chamber for all of the individual contracts and RFP's and would be willing, as one commissioner, to do so to the NAACP as well. You are right, the District Justice gives you a unique opportunity for minority participation. I will be heavily pushing for minority participation in the district justice offices.

Ms. Jones: Thank you. I also hope that the Asian community will also be included. It is a diverse community. We do have a number of vendors.

Mr. Haste: There has been an affirmative action plan in place for a few years. It may not of gotten the attention it should of over the past few years but I know that there is one. When I was here as chief clerk, I was quite involved in that and there was a lady, since then has retired from county government who oversaw it, Clara Sloane. I think we need to take another look at it and make sure that we are doing all that we need to do. It relays the message whether it be programs, services or potential business opportunities and that is something we need to take a look at and make sure that we are doing a good

job. I do know that the district justice situation came up before us and I believe each one of us in our way have made contact with those who are involved that if they sub work out that they deal with people in their neighborhoods. I think that you add pride to that building if you have people from that area help build that facility. We heard that message and took it back.

Ms. Jones: When I am advocating for diversity, because I believe every child of god is given certain talents at birth and then manifest in life so the capability exists in everyone, I like to see that brought to government because I feel that it is the most efficient model financially. It is the model reflecting on our being taxpayers. Thank you.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Commissioner Haste: Are there any Department Directors/Guests to address the Board at this time? (There were none.)

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: I have an addendum this week to the vacancy request to fill a clinical coordinator vacancy because that person is moving in to one of the newly created positions. There is a new hire for Facilities Maintenance and a changes addendum for positions at Spring Creek. From last week's packet in the changes addendum, the two merit increases for Judge Evans' staff, that were getting the balance of their 2004 increase. Details have not been worked out yet and we will pull them until issues are resolved. So that is one and two of the August 18, 2004 changes listing addendum.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve the personnel packet?

Mr. DiFrancesco: So moved.

Mr. Hartwick: Second.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Haste: Motion carried. Just to give you a heads up we just interviewed for vacant Sergeant and vacant Lieutenant positions at the Prison so that will be forthcoming.

Ms. Sinner: I spoke to Mark and that will be on next week.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Haste: Purchase Orders, Mr. Baratucci.

Mr. Baratucci: No changes from last week other than we cleared up all the budget issues. I did want to mention that on page four are the upgrades to the security systems at all of the District Justice Offices. I know there were some memos and emails going back and forth on how we were going to pay for this we found some money in our Security Department and they are going to pay for the upgrades. That should make the Courts happy. That should also get all of the offices up to snuff with all of the latest needs that they identified.

Mr. Haste: Thank you to Mike and all of those identified because this is an issue highlighted in a District Justice Office and the concerns that were going on there. In fact, it was significant enough that the State Supreme Court has issued an order in putting together committees in each county regarding security in the District Justice Offices. I am glad that our Security Department stepped to the plate on this issue. Is there a motion to approve the Purchasing Packet?

Mr. Hartwick: So moved.
Mr. DiFrancesco: Second.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Haste: Motion carries.

REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR

Mr. Yohe:

- **August 13, 2004** transferred **\$827,397.88** to the **Payables** account from the **County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **August 20, 2004** transferred **\$8,283,846.18** to the **Payables** account and **\$1,814,674.40** 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 \$121,852.57 rate 1.37%**
- **Balance today in Community Banks investment account \$23,440,345.12 rate 2.25%** (This rate is good through 12/31/04)
- **Balance today in Commerce Bank investment account \$10,024,003.45 rate 2.25%** (This rate is good indefinitely)
- **Balance today in Waypoint Bank investment account \$14,529,057.37 rate 2.25%** (This rate is good through 11/1/04)

\$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
 - o Total \$4,650,000.00
- April 1, 2004 – TRAN was paid back with \$11,232.21 for interest expense.

At the last meeting I mentioned the spread between 2.25 and our comparative rate at Invest is not as great as it was. I have contacted all three banks and there really wasn't any reception. I am still working on it. The only comment I got was if we raise it up, will we get more money. Hopefully one will bump it up then the others will bump it up

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just a question, Commerce and Waypoint numbers were matching each other for a while, now they have changed?

Mr. Yohe: I am trying to diversify first with Waypoint. Commerce has not gotten me the information that I am looking for yet, when they do we will bump some up. Again, really Community was the only one even considering bumping the rates at this point in time. Budget meetings get on the way today. I have gotten 60% back. I will give it until the end of the week. I will be sending notices out next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: When were they due?

Mr. Yohe: Last Friday.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Haste: Report from the Chief Clerk.

Mr. Saylor: I need to bring an issue to your attention. To adequately do so I am going to bring Mr. Howe forward. This issue is a result of a new State law, Governor Rendell is seeking to cure all of the State's evils by allowing the expansion of gambling in the state. However, in doing so, there are a number of issues involved for the county that we have to undertake in order to fully implement the changes due to the expansion of gambling. To do this Steve is going to explain that we need to invest in a new application for our software. We will eventually be reimbursed for this expenditure by the school districts. The gambling law which was enacted in July, does not go into effect until September but even so we need to move forward to get this going as quickly as possible so the school districts are gearing up in September.

Mr. Howe: As Chad said you may recall a couple weeks ago I was before the Board and mentioned that ACT 72 which is the Homeowner Tax Relief Act was passed and signed into law by the Governor on July 5, 2004. It basically provides the distribution which is commonly known of by the school districts as "slots for tots". This is money that will be distributed by the state gambling fund for school districts for reduction of the school real estate tax. The law takes effect 60 days after being signed by the Governor. This would be in the neighborhood of around September 4, 2004. Our position as we are looking at the mandates of the school districts and what requirements it puts on the County Assessment Office, is that we need to work proactively and step up to the plate in getting our processes into place in order to handle potentially 70,000 to 75,000 new applications for consideration by my Department. We put together a plan partnering with GANCOM who is our primary printer supplier for tax bills as well as Manatron who is our software company to propose to the school districts. We did this on August 20, 2004. This is a program where the County basically would be facilitator of printing of the applications to comply with Act 72 and notification to all citizens within the particular school districts that the program is available. The proposal was very well received by the school districts and they were thankful that Dauphin County is stepping up to the plate and taking an active role in providing this service for them. They have no concept on how they would otherwise handle the mailing to their constituents. The first mandated mailing would be around October 18, 2004 so waiting until the beginning of September, in my opinion, is too late to get our ducks in a row to timely meet the requirements of the act. In front of you for approval today is a change order that would allow Manatron to modify the existing program that we have with them now to accommodate the new requirements of Act 72. Thankfully Dauphin County is in a position to offer school districts within our boundaries and with having to deal with Act 50 for Central Dauphin, we have a lot of software in place that basically accommodates that Act on behalf of Central Dauphin School District. There are some new changes to Act 50 through Act 72 and place different mailing requirements on us, the Assessment Office, on behalf of the School Districts, that require our existing software to be modified. What you are looking at is the change order that provides for that modification. In the proposal to the school district, for the first year, the County will step up to the plate and guarantee to make payments to the vendors in order to get the mailing done and the school districts will be billed for that process and our recouping the cost of the software modifications is included in the proposals to the school districts. To make a long story short, we, the County, although we are putting the money up front, will be reimbursed 100% and a small amount for administrative costs on behalf of the County from the school districts 100% for our expenditures. In my opinion, we need to move forward on this immediately and that is why we are on the agenda today to ask you to approve change order number R001 to Manatron to allow them to begin on the software modifications immediately to comply with statutory mailing dates.

Mr. Haste: I knew about the meeting you had with the school districts and the need to go to the mail house. I did not realize we had to change our software. Is this something we cannot do internally? Maybe I do not understand the process; I understand it was us doing the mailing. How do we have to change our software to do a mailing?

Mr. Howe: We have to change the software in order to internally handle the additional 70,000-80,000 applications we will receive back due to that mailing process. We need to form a way to provide an

application to the property owners that includes specific property data. For Act 50 what we did was basically provide a blank application to every citizen of Central Dauphin School District and to every citizen in Dauphin County who cared to respond. To date we have the potential of 25,000 properties in Central Dauphin School District that ACT 50 could apply to. We have only had responses from 15,000. So our purpose for modifying the software would allow us internally to handle that additional volume of returned applications by including on that application specific property information that would allow us to electronically process the application when it comes back to us. With this process we would not have to have staff sit and manually enter data into a database in order to maintain this ACT 72 role of applications. This would allow us, through the application process, to basically scan the application, automatically update the information in our database, the information from the application thus shortening the staff requirements or staff time tremendously to count for each individual application. That requires a modification to the software process. Secondly, ACT 72 requires as ACT 50 did not a return mail piece to every applicant from the County Assessment Office. That means if we get 70,000 applications in, we are obligated to respond to all 70,000 applications. Act 50 only required that we notify applicants who's application was denied. Now our obligation is to notify everyone whether their application is approved, denied or filed late. This would allow us, through software modification and scanning the application, to post a note to the electronic database and allow us to file or outsource to Gancom again a file that would allow them to print a letter on our behalf to say that your application was approved, denied or filed late. That was again a modification to the software process. Otherwise we would probably be looking at 3, 4, 5 or possibly 6 additional staff people to do the manual input of the data into the database and get the mailings out in-house. Also we have no ability to really take advantage of mass mailings and personal discounts that are available to group, sort mail the way the post office wants it done to drive that \$.37 rate down to the \$.28 or \$.29 range.

Mr. Haste: If we do this, do we know it will work?

Mr. Howe: Internally we have every confidence that Manatron will deliver this. They know the short deadline we are on and in fact their Chief programming person is working on this as we speak to develop a detailed source report or detailed design report of how the system would work.

Mr. Haste: You understand my nervousness?

Mr. Howe: I understand and you are not alone and we made this very clear to the folks that this is something that we need delivered timely.

Mr. Hartwick: Steve, refresh my memory, did we discuss this at all, you and I?

Mr. Howe: We did not. I attempted to see you and I provided the data to Kacey.

Mr. Hartwick: At 9:00 this morning.

Mr. Howe: Whatever time this morning, yes.

Mr. Hartwick: So we did not even have a chance to communicate about the change order or anything involved in this request?

Mr. Howe: No, because we are on a very tight and short time frame. We did not know the school districts would buy into this until after the meeting on August 20, 2004.

Mr. Hartwick: So, the bill was passed July 5, 2004 and you met with the school districts on August 20, 2004, and how comes we did not even have a discussion about this at all. Today I am being told in the hallway that this is going to be on the agenda.

Mr. Howe: And for that I do apologize. It is just that time is short in getting the whole process put together. We are working together with our vendors to put costs together. The proposal for mailing to the school districts is still in the Solicitor's office and that just got to them a day ago.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there anyone else who could perform this software function?

Mr. Howe: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Hartwick: Have we shopped around?

Mr. Howe: We have not because the process is so new my discussion with other Assessment Offices is that they do not even know what their requirements or what their responsibilities are at this point in time. There is no meeting with CCAP and the other Assessment Offices until September 24, 2004.

Mr. Hartwick: So, every other county in the state is going to be forced to go with Manatron?

Mr. Howe: I suspect not but our position is we already have Act 50 software in place to handle the Homestead exclusion applications. With simple modifications to that software we can accommodate Act 72. The other counties my best guess is have no idea what their requirements are or how they are going to handle the requirements until September 24, 2004. At that point in time, we are too late.

Mr. Hartwick: Did we even have a conversation about what was going to happen to the school districts? It would have been a great opportunity to hear feed back. The idea being for us to communicate and that I would disseminate a lot of this information to the Board and Chad. Talking to everybody at 9:00 a.m. this morning is certainly not appropriate protocol for these situations. Particularly, when we had notice and time for consideration and I only speak as one Commissioner here but I think one of the issues related to us in tax reassessment is software for Manatron and I for one am not going to spend any more money until they have done and delivered on what they said they would deliver on. That is just one Commissioner speaking.

Mr. Tully: I believe they were working under the assumption that this would be ministerial and money was coming from the school districts and not us and they were planning on coming forward without a formal vote. They brought it to my attention this morning and I insisted since we were fronting the money that it be presented to the Board. That is why there wasn't a lot of lead time and when I saw it this morning I said I wanted it in a public meeting. I am the one who changed the direction in which they were going.

Mr. Hartwick: As oversight Commissioner I do not know if I would have even heard about it unless you directed them to bring it in the public meeting, which is a concern of mine to begin with.

Mr. Tully: That is why they meet with me and we caught this one at the appropriate time.

Mr. Howe: I did bring this up at a Workshop two weeks ago that I was meeting with the school districts. The three Commissioners were all in attendance.

Mr. Haste: We all knew about this project and your intent and moving forward and the only surprise was the software.

Mr. Howe: We are far ahead in the software arena only because of Act 50.

Mr. Haste: What you have done with the school boards and things I think is very proactive and a good service. I just wish we had another option in this part.

Mr. Howe: Unfortunately with the time constraints with the Act, we don't have any other options. For our I.T. Department to write new software or for us to contract out another vendor, would be even more of a concern with me for not meeting the deadlines as it is having the change order with Manatron.

Mr. Hartwick: Commissioner Haste, you got all of that with his testimony presented here in an hour and a half on the reassessment issue?

Mr. Haste: In a conversation I had with him I knew he had met with the school directors, and I did a follow up after that meeting and we talked about the letters and if I was comfortable on fronting the effort because of timing and I was all for that.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, I would have been too if I knew about it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We talked in past meetings about the burden placed on the County by this legislation and the number of applications. What does it mean to us in a request for additional personnel without the program vs. with this program, what are your expectations?

Mr. Howe: With the program enhancements, I don't expect any additional requirements for personnel with the application containing a bar code and our ability to scan, the document electronically updates the database. I don't anticipate any additional staff requirements.

Mr. Haste: As I understand this, part of this attempt is not to have to increase staff.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is what I am trying to clarify.

Mr. Howe: That is correct.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So if we upgrade the software, there will be no additional staff needed. If we don't get the upgrade, what are your expectations?

Mr. Howe: I really did not do a study to see how many additional staff folks would be needed. My guess is a staff increase of three to do 70,000 applications in a three month period.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Full time or part time?

Mr. Howe: They could be part time; however, this is an annual process. It would be a December through May period for processing of applications. The application period is December through March that would be our heavy times of receiving applications. We need to make the report to the state on or before May 1.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In regards to the Solicitor's office and Solicitor's review, I know you just started to work on it and the deal is not complete, but the bottom line are we going to clearly define what it is we are buying and what our expectations are and have teeth should they not meet our expectations. We bought a car before but we did not tell them what the car was supposed to be like. Are we telling them clearly what we are buying?

Mr. Tully: In all candor, with the same time constraints and basically stuck in our organizations and theirs in a short time, there is not a lot of room. They are basically the sole provider and with the time constraints that are placed, as long as he is comfortable, I am comfortable. That is kind of where we are.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Where I want it to go and where it will go is that we have a defined time line and they say yes we can meet that and we say if you don't meet that here is the deal. They should pull out with everything else that is out on the table, this Board then can come back and negotiate with them, but what I don't want is "Dauphin County your back is up against the wall", because it is not.

Mr. Tully: This will not fall under that category.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I wanted to clearly define that if they don't meet our time line and it doesn't do what we want it to do, there are a lot of pieces of anatomy that are on the line.

Mr. Tully: The concern that I have is the tougher I make it on this end; they have an option of saying no thank you. Then we are in a situation where there is no option.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This company should care about its relationship with us, their customer.

Mr. Tully: My understanding is that they very much want to make it work, this has a lot to do with the rest of the program, and they know this has to be done.

Mr. DiFrancesco: You would think that companies would deliver on what they are being paid for but it has been proven to this Board that if teeth aren't in contracts, there is no obligation to perform. So now we know we have to put big teeth in contracts regardless of what company we are dealing with.

Mr. Howe: If you look at the last paragraph, it says approval of this document further implies acceptance by the software company detailed design report relevant to the project. That is the detailed design report that we are asking for our IT Department to look at that guarantees that at least the detail of what we expect to receive. In the past, we did not have that. We added that to their change order.

Mr. Haste: Maybe the way we could do it is that they get no payment until the project is done.

Mr. Tully: I don't think there is any provision here that says they get paid anything until the product is delivered satisfactory.

Mr. Haste: This stuff of paying people up front has stopped. If you deliver the product satisfactory, then you will get paid.

Mr. Howe: If you look at the handout that says cost impact, payment approved upon acceptance of the county in the compliance to the county in a production environment or whatever occurs first. That basically says we pay when the project is completed.

Mr. Haste: We need to have a vote on this change order today. Steve would like this voted on today so we can keep the school districts on this proactive timeline, is this correct.

Mr. Howe: Yes.

Mr. Saylor: Is there an absolute deadline? The sooner the better obviously.

Mr. Howe: Our time line for the software to be delivered to the county for evaluation is September 23. With the first mailing due no later than October 18, our proposal time line is to get the mailing out for the school districts the first week in October.

Mr. Haste: Does Mr. Guenther in IT know about this?

Mr. Howe: Tom is aware of it; Greg Bush and Randy Thiellman have looked at this with me.

Mr. Haste: Are they ok with it?

Mr. Howe: Yes. Greg's suggestion was the paragraph I eluded to earlier on the detailed design report.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve the change order R001?

Mr. DiFrancesco: So moved.

Mr. Haste: Second. Any discussion?

Mr. Hartwick: Besides being disappointed about the procedure and not knowing it was on our agenda, I am going to make it very clear that I will not give another dime to Manatron until they deliver on what they were already contracted to provide. They currently have not lived up to their billing and I don't see throwing good money out to bad in this position.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Haste and Mr. DiFrancesco: Aye.

Mr. Hartwick. No.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tully: Nothing to add other than what is on the report at this time.

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

Mr. Haste: Matters requiring Board action. Items A-N. Is there anything that needs to be pulled or acted on separately? (There was none.)

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve items A-N?

- A. Training Packet
- B. Approval of FY04/05 Per Diem Rates between Children & Youth Agency and:
 - 1. Cornell Abraxas Group, Inc. \$392,057/max, yr.
 - 2. Cambria County Detention Center
 - Detention \$165.00/day
 - Shelter Care \$159.00/day
 - 3. Visiting Nurse Association of Central PA
 - Subsequent Visit rate for Child T.C. only \$60.00/hr (FY03/04)
 - 4. Concern Professional Services for Children, Youth & Families
 - Foster Care-traditional ages 0-11 \$33.00/day
 - Foster Care-traditional ages 12+ \$38.00/day
 - Foster Care-Intermediate ages 0-11 \$60.00/day
 - Foster Care-Intermediate ages 12+ \$68.00/day
 - Foster Care-Treatment ages 0-11 \$76.00/day
 - Foster Care-Treatment ages 12+ \$83.75/day
 - Foster Care-Life Skills \$92.50/day
 - Foster Care-Disabilities \$95.00/day
 - Foster Care-Disabilities-Level I \$75.64/day
 - Foster Care-Disabilities-Level II \$65.34/day
 - Foster Care-Disabilities-Level III \$45.69/day
 - Foster Care-Disabilities-Level IV \$28.81/day
 - Van rental (handicap accessible) \$60.00/day
 - Foster Care-Respite \$56.50/day
 - Foster Care-Short Term/Shelter \$127.00/day
 - Community Life Skills \$109.00/day
 - Treatment Units for Boys I, II, III \$178.00/day
 - Sexual Offender Services for R.D.
 - Evaluation \$255.00/3 hr.
 - Individual Therapy \$85.00/session
 - Group Therapy \$30.00/session
 - 5. Cornell Abraxas Group, Inc.
 - Non-residential treatment-NRT \$50.00/day
 - Non-residential detention, NRD \$40.81/day
 - Day Treatment-re-entry phase \$20.93/day
 - Day Treatment program \$85.71/day
 - Day Treatment-severe weather emergency \$20.93/day
 - 6. Community Specialists Corporation

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------|
| | Sanction/Diagnostic unit | \$124.85/day |
| | The Academy Girls Residential unit | \$165.00/day |
| 7. | Harmony Center, Inc. | |
| | Residential service | \$166.00/day |
| | D&A Brookside Program Adolescent short term | \$198.00/day |
| | D&A Adolescent moderate-term | \$184.00/day |
| | D&A Adolescent long term | \$179.00/day |
| 8. | Pyramid Healthcare, Inc. | |
| | Skyline Lodge Group Home | \$166.00/day |
| | Winterhaven Lodge | \$166.00/day |
| | Winterhaven Lodge Intensive Treatment | \$189.00/day |
| | Green Tree Village | \$166.00/day |
| | Hemlock Diagnostic | \$197.00/day |
| | Hickory Lodge | \$166.00/day |
| | Ridgeview Adolescent Behavioral Health Center | |
| | D&A short-term | \$203.00/day |
| | D&A moderate term | \$189.00/day |
| | D&A long term | \$183.00/day |
| 9. | The Summit School, Inc. | |
| | Summit School residential | \$91.56/day |
| | Sanction/Diagnostic | \$124.85/day |
| | Summit School D&A | \$144.00/day |
| | Emotional & Behavioral Support unit | \$175.00/day |
| 10. | Family Care for Children & Youth, Inc. | |
| | Children under age 3/emergency | \$52.66/day |
| | Family based treatment/emergency | \$60.18/day |
| | Family Reunification/family based treatment | \$80.55/day |
| | Mother with infant/emergency | \$29.54/day |
| 11. | Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. | |
| | Group Community based detention | \$12.50/hr |
| | Individual Community based detention | \$25.00/hr |
| | Group Community based treatment serv. | \$12.50/hr. |
| | Individual Community based treatment serv. | \$25.00/hr |

C. Real Estate Tax Refunds/Exonerations:

1. Partial refund of 2002-2004 County & Municipal real estate taxes to Terry & Elizabeth Bush, 509 North 2nd. St., Harrisburg, parcel #04-017-004, in the amt. of \$471.87.
2. Partial refund of 2002 & 2003 County & Municipal real estate taxes to Gary & Georgeann Miceli, 17 Scout Lane, South Hanover Township, parcel #56-013-103, in the amt. of \$122.39.
3. Refund of 2004 County & Municipal real estate taxes to Richard Yingst, Jr., open space, West Hanover Township, parcel #68-047-001, in the amt. of \$320.10.
4. Refund of 2004 County & Municipal real estate taxes to Lykens Borough, Arch Street, Borough of Lykens, parcel #37-003-008, in the amt. of \$22.22.
5. Refund of 2002 real estate taxes to Marc Slomskie, 3057 Krepps Road, Londonderry Township, parcel #34-011-128-001-0001, in the amt. of \$984.62.
6. Partial refund of 2002-2004 real estate taxes to Donald Poorman, 703 South Harrisburg St., Swatara Township, in the amt. of \$259.80.

- D. Resolution No. 25-2004 approving a continuation of a Highway Project Grant "Dauphin County Sobriety Checkpoint and Expanded DUI/Underage Drinking Enforcement Program" between C.I.D. and the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

- E. Satisfaction Pieces for the following individuals:
1. Diane M. Bacon on property located at 737 S. Front St., Steelton.
 2. Duy H. Duong & Lan T. Nguyen on property located at 923 South 15th St. Harrisburg.
 3. Monique A. Pollard on property located at 810 N. 16th St., Harrisburg.
- F. Subordination Agreements with the following individuals:
1. Carita M. Ellis for property located at 2241 Penn St., Harrisburg.
 2. Theresa A. Strange for property located at 513 Cherrington Dr., Harrisburg.
 3. Quent Neely and Aquilla Boswell for property located at 1937 Penn St., Harrisburg.
 4. Willie Barbara Wheeler and Christal Williams for property located at 205 Muench St., Harrisburg.
- G. Amendment to Extend a Lease Agreement between Dauphin County and Pizza Hut Restaurant #605144 located on Paxton St., Harrisburg.
- H. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY04/05 between MH/MR and:
1. Melmark, Inc.
 2. Keystone Service Systems, Inc.
 3. Partnership of Packer, Osterling & Smith, Inc.
- I. Addendum to FY04/05 Purchase of Service Agreements between MH/MR and:
1. Karen Kinzie Reale, OTR/L – Amendment #1
 2. Portraits of Life Adult Day Service – Amendment #1
- J. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY04/05 between Children & Youth Agency and:
1. Lancaster County (Youth Intervention Center)
 2. Centre County (Youth Service Bureau)
 3. Adelphoi Village
 4. Clear Brook, Inc.
 5. University of Pittsburgh (CWEL Programs for CYS employee Judith A. Turnbaugh)
 6. Diversified Treatment Alternatives, Inc.
 7. Boys & Girls Club of Central Pennsylvania, Inc.
 8. United Methodist Home for Children (Emergency Shelter)
 9. Bethany Christian Services of Central Pennsylvania
 10. ChildFirst Services, Inc.
 11. Family Service Partners
 12. Life Management Associates Systems Group, Inc.
 13. Families United Network, Inc.
 14. Hoffman Homes of Youth
 15. Pressley Ridge School
 16. Friendship House
 17. United Methodist Home for Children Residential Care, Inc.
 18. Specialized Treatment Services, Inc.
 19. Children's Choice
 20. Bethany Christian Services of Central Pennsylvania
 21. Clear Vision Residential Treatment Services, Inc.

- K. Amendment #1 to FY04/05 Purchase of Service Agreement between Children & Youth Agency and Visiting Nurse Association of Central Pennsylvania.
- L. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY04/05 between Area Agency on Aging and:
 - 1. Keystone Residence
 - 2. South Central Emergency Medical Services, Inc.
- M. Adoption Assistance Agreements:
 - 1. #2004-19
 - 2. #2004-20
 - 3. #2004-21
- N. Resolution No. 26-2004 regarding insurance coverage for certain county employees.

Mr. Saylor: Are we set on Resolution number 26? Okay, we were making some grammatical changes but they were completed this morning.

Mr. Hartwick: So moved.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Second.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Haste: Motion carries.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

Mr. Hartwick: Question for Personnel in regards to the affirmative action plan, was that 1996 or 1986. We did meet on this topic and I just want to make sure I am reporting accurate information.

Ms. Sinner: We do have an affirmative action plan, we are not tracking transfers or promotions. We are just logging in applications and we are updating it.

Mr. Hartwick: Good, my impression was different from our meeting. I just want to set the record straight. We do have an affirmative action plan but one that is not living and breathing any of the practices that are meant through the law. I would like a copy of the plan.

Ms. Sinner: It has not been changed since 1986.

FORMER BUSINESS

There was none.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Haste: You have seen on the agenda the correspondence received by the Board of Commissioners this week A-N, which will be handled appropriately by the staff.

- A. Received notification from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (CDBG Funds) indicating we are authorized to use the HUD funds as listed in the letter.

- B. Received correspondence from Capital Area Transit in reference to the Corridor One minimum operating segment, Cumberland County, Dauphin County and Lancaster County in reference to the determination of eligibility/determination of effects of the project.
- C. Received a thank you note from Parish Health Ministry for the assistance of printing brochures.
- D. Received from Benatec Associates a copy of the 2004 Interim bridge inspection report.
- E. Received correspondence from GSA Public Buildings Service indicating they are seeking a site to build a proposed new Federal Courthouse facility.
- F. Notification from Dawood Engineering, Inc., indicating they intend to apply to the Dauphin County Conservation District for a NPDES permit for the Capitol Heights Phase IV project. The project is bound to the north by Kelker Street, to the west by Susquehanna Street, to the south by Harris Street, and to the east by North Fifth Street which will include construction of townhouses and streets.
- G. Notification from R. J. Fisher & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Triple Crown Corporation, indicating they intend to apply to DEP for a NPDES permit for discharge of stormwater associated with construction activities for Ivy Ridge Development located in Swatara Township.
- H. Notification from Light-Heigel & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Hershey Entertainment and Resorts Company (HERCO), indicating they intend to apply for a NPDES permit to DEP in reference to a proposed plan for construction of a paved parking area, swimming pool and associated structures, Derry Township.
- I. Notification from Ephraim J. Lapp indicating he intends to apply to DEP for a general permit for the installation of an agricultural stream crossing on his property located at 323 St. David Drive, Upper Paxton Township.
- J. Received notification from DEP indicating they have scheduled a public hearing regarding an application submitted by the Dauphin Meadows Landfill to be held Thursday, September 16, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. at the Millersburg Area High School Auditorium.
- K. Notification from H. Edward Black and Associates, P.C., on behalf of Szeles and DeVan families, indicating they plan to submit an application to DEP and the Dauphin County Conservation District for a general permit for the discharges of storm water from construction activities at the Spring Creek Hollows/Kendale Oaks II project, Lower Paxton and Swatara Townships, Dauphin County.
- L. Notification from Hoover Engineering Services, Inc., indicating that Sierra Glen Developers intends to apply for a NPDES permit for stormwater discharges from construction of a 240 unit self-storage facility located at 5407 Locust Lane, Harrisburg.
- M. Received correspondence from Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency announcing the availability of \$1.8 million over three years in federal Drug Control and System Improvement (DCSI) grant funds to support the development of model aftercare approaches, which will inform the development of statewide training on the model approaches. Applications are being sought from counties.

- N. Received correspondence from Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency announcing the availability of \$250,000 in federal Drug Control and System Improvement grant funds allocated to support the implementation or expansion of juvenile prosecution and/or defense capacity building projects within district attorney and public defense offices. Applications are being solicited for Juvenile Prosecution and Defense Capacity Building programs.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Hartwick: So moved.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Second.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor say, aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Haste: Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

Transcribed by: Kacey Truax
printed 10/12/04