



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner's Legislative Meeting

Wednesday, October 19, 2005 (10:00AM)

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk; Elke Moyer, Human Services Directors Office; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Faye Fisher, Director of Personnel and Payroll Office; Greg Schneider, Budget and Finance; Kelly Wolf, Manager of Solid Waste and Recycling; Tom Guenther, Director of Information Technology; Bruce Foreman, Esq.; Solicitor's Office; Guy Beneventano, Esq.; Solicitor's Office; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Dan Eisenhower, Mental Health/Mental Retardation; Steve Libhart, District Attorney's Office; D'Juana Gaither, Emergency Management Agency.

GUESTS PRESENT

David Latorre; Smittie Brown, Executive Director Dauphin County Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol, Inc.

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 the September 28, 2005 Workshop Meeting minutes and the September 21, 2005 Legislative Meeting Minutes. Is there a motion to approve these minutes?

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to approve the September 28, 2005 Workshop Meeting minutes and the September 21, 2005 Legislative Meeting Minutes. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Haste: We have the September 21, 2005 Salary Board Meeting Minutes. The Salary Board consists of the three Commissioners and Controller. Is there a motion to approve these minutes?

Mr. Hartwick made the motion to approve the August 3, 2005 Salary Board Meeting minutes. Ms. Rebeck seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor: There was one Executive Session held on October 10, 2005 to discuss contract negotiations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

DIRECTORS/GUESTS

- A. Stephen Libhart, District Attorney's Office and Smittie Brown, Executive Director Dauphin County Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol, Inc.
 - 1. Drug and Alcohol Restrictive Intermediate Punishment Grant.

Mr. Libhart: Good Morning. Last week I had come with a proposal for a grant to be issued from PCCD for a Drug and Alcohol Restrictive Intermediate Punishment Program. The goal of the program is to, in cooperation with treatment, reduce our recidivism rate and the other things that go along with that. The primary person who will

be hired as a case manager will work out of Smittie's Office. If you have any questions after reading the proposal we will be happy to field them.

Mr. Hartwick: The one question we had, is this going to be fully funded from PCCD or something that you will be responsible for as the years progress? These grants normally phase out through the years.

Mr. Brown: After three years if we do not continue to get the funding then we would be responsible for it. It is not a cost that the County would be incurring.

Mr. Hartwick: Any costs would be coming out of the Drugs and Alcohol budget for staff?

Mr. Brown: Yes, after three years, if we do not get the funding continuation from PCCD. I think the goal of the project is to assist the County's criminal justice system. This is the first time that you see a coordinated effort between the District Attorney's Office, The Executive Commission of Drugs and Alcohol, Adult Probation and the treatment providers. We can get our arms around people so they do not re-enter the jail like they have been. Most of the people in the Dauphin County Prison right now are repeaters.

Mr. Hartwick: I am all for the concept. The concern that I have is how are you planning in your budget to assume more personnel as these issues come up related to the criminal justice system? Are you planning on additional personnel with other initiatives that are coming through the court system? Is there a plan to try to offset the phase out of the PCCD grant with other additional money that is not going into direct services?

Mr. Brown: First, certainly we want to use the PCCD money to cover the cost of that case manager. That case manager will primarily be used to speed up the process. Once these individuals get identified for the appropriate program they will be assessed within 72 hours and then granted permission from the County criminal justice system and will be placed into treatment. That will be their task to make sure all of these things happen in a very efficient manner. To answer the second part of your question on our plans, the grant right now is for one year. My office has not gone after grants unless we feel that we can sustain them for at least three years on our own. As you know, we can get funding from a number of sources today and it will be gone tomorrow. We look at it for at least a three year period to see if the bottom dropped out on us, can we fund it on our own?

Mr. Hartwick: You said this is the first in a number of initiatives to partner with the criminal justice system in order to try to provide a layer of support with the Commission on Drugs and Alcohol and staffers. What are those other initiatives that are in the works?

Mr. Brown: I have talked to this Board last year that we get Federal dollars for women and children. As you know there are a number of women in the County criminal justice system. It works on a need-by-need basis. The County criminal justice system to date has not been able to utilize those services and the dollars to place these women who

are in county prison placed into long term treatment services. They can stay nine, twelve to eighteen months. I believe you all know the benefits of long term treatment vs. short term treatment. That is just one of the initiatives to be able to look at some of the women that are in our criminal justice system, and place them in treatment programs, therefore, we are relieving the county of some of that burden of having to deal with those women and some of those women are pregnant.

Mr. Hartwick: From our perspective, which would be great if you could place these folks in treatment where they belong and alleviate the burden from the county general fund. What are the barriers that are in place that are not allowing you to accomplish that?

Mr. Brown: I believe this initiative will help break down those barriers. You do have to have your District Attorney's Office, your probation office, the single county authority and your treatment providers all on the same page. I think this proposal is just the beginning to help the county identify barriers in the system so you can really start to impact the criminal justice system.

Mr. Hartwick: It would be nice if you could provide the Commissioners with long range plans on how you plan to address those issues.

Mr. Brown: Sure.

Mr. Haste: Where would this person be housed?

Mr. Brown: In my office.

Mr. Haste: Why aren't they housed at the Prison?

Mr. Brown: Why aren't they housed at the Prison? In years passed, we did have case managers housed at the Prison for three days a week. Space is at a premium at the Prison.

Mr. Haste: Space may not be as nice at the Prison as it is in your building but there is space. My concern with a lot of these programs are they sound good and look good on paper but the case manager needs to be where the action is. It is not on Cameron Street.

Mr. Brown: If there is space available, I certainly would not give an argument about placing someone at the Prison a couple days a week to speed up the process.

Mr. Haste: Actually, if you would have told me a couple days a week at the Prison and a couple days a week at the courthouse, I would feel better.

Mr. Libhart: This program would identify only individuals for program participation when they first enter the judicial system. It is to avoid prison. There would be no incarceration time associated with this program. It would be intensive supervision with

extensive electronic monitoring and through weekly, and if need be daily, meetings with both Adult Probation and a case manager. I guess from our stand point, we didn't think about putting anyone at the prison because the intention is to avoid prison time.

Mr. Haste: Why aren't we doing it now? I know we send these people instead of jail, to a place in Lancaster.

Mr. Libhart: Like a work release?

Mr. Haste: Courts sentence people now to treatment facilities.

Mr. Libhart: They do.

Mr. Haste: How is this going to make that any better?

Mr. Brown: It is not a speedy process right now. If you looked at it right now from start to finish, it may take several months for the person to be identified, assessed, go through the system and lastly to get placed into treatment. What this does is commits all the players to identify key people in their organization to make this process work.

Mr. Haste: Shouldn't this person be in the District Attorney's Office?

Mr. Libhart: We could potentially house this person in the District Attorney's Office. The majority of the software and tools to analyze all of the benefits of the program are available more so at the Commission of Drugs and Alcohol. They already have the software that this individual would use to place them. We do not have it in our office.

Mr. Haste: So this person is only going to be used after they have been sentenced. How are they going to get the list of the names of the people to talk to the person and know what cases are coming up?

Mr. Libhart: We would provide that.

Mr. Haste: How are you going to do that?

Mr. Libhart: As soon as somebody is eligible due to their offense, if they requested to participate in this program, then we would have to provide that name to the case manager to arrange for the initial assessment to be done within 24 hours of being notified.

Mr. Haste: Why isn't that being done now?

Mr. Libhart: We currently do not have a program in place to do that now.

Mr. Brown: These are a level three or four.

Mr. Haste: So it is a program not a person you need?

Mr. Libhart: It is a combination of both. We are instituting the program and a case manager will basically administer 90% of the program.

Mr. Brown: The case manager will get involved after the person is identified through the DA's office as being appropriate for the program as a level three or level four non-violent offender. This case manager comes in and does a drug and alcohol evaluation on the person, checks back with the criminal justice system to see if the person is appropriate for the program, and then would move on to treatment. This case manager makes all of the treatment arrangements and the weekly updates to the criminal justice system to tell if this person is doing well or not in the program.

Mr. Haste: How much are we paying this case worker?

Mr. Libhart: I believe \$30,000.00 a year. Also, this funding stream has been in existence for four years now and about 27 other counties have already taken advantage of the funding to institute a program similar to the one we are proposing here in Dauphin County. There is one currently in York and Lancaster Counties. I was informed last week that the funding has already been earmarked for availability next year so we have every reason to assume that we would receive on a twelve month basis. We only have eight months left on the funding for this program so most of these figures are based on eight months. We could expect to receive a like sum for a twelve month continuation project going twenty months in advance.

Mr. Brown: Judge Lewis and the District Attorney feel very good about the program.

Mr. Haste: I do too. My only concern is that I am wondering if we are spending the money in the right direction. I do not know if I would feel better if we were using that money to place people. But we aren't doing that. I do not know why we need another staff person and why we can't be doing that now. For us to just break even, this person is going to have to keep two people out of jail every day of the year. For us to know that is a success, I want you to be able to show me next year when we reapply that two people and I want to see the names, for every single day that they were out of jail.

Mr. Brown: It is projected that for eight months we would see about 200 people.

Mr. Haste: Good. I hope that you can show me two people per day.

Mr. Brown: I do not know if that comes out to two people per day. I am not sure what that comes out to.

Mr. Haste: These programs sound good. My frustration is I go out there every Tuesday and I hear all of these do good, feel good programs and they aren't working. I am not sure why we weren't doing this before. Everyone knows how important and serious this is. Why can't a case worker that you have now be doing this now? It appears to be on

the placement side, not necessarily managing and sitting at a desk worrying about where people are.

Mr. Brown: PCCD will not permit you to use your existing staff for any projects.

Mr. Haste: I am not worried about PCCD. I am saying why isn't this being done now?

Mr. Brown: I think that this is the first time that there has been energy from all of the players to do this. The failure has been people have looked at treatment as the flu. This takes the effort of the District Attorney's Office, the hard work of Adult Probation, the treatment providers and the case manager to all be on the same page and work with these people. It really hasn't happened in the past with this commitment. Everyone did their own thing. This is the first time that there has been a coordinated effort. Everyone is going to work on the same page.

Mr. Haste: The missing link is this case worker?

Mr. Brown: Where is the missing link at with the case worker?

Mr. Haste: I am asking you that.

Mr. Brown: The case manager is the only approved individual that PCCD, the Department of Welfare and the Department of Health will recognize to do the assessment, make the referral into the treatment program.

Mr. Haste: How much is the total grant?

Mr. Libhart: \$525,000.

Mr. Brown: That covers all layers of service for out-patient to in-patient. A lot of that is short term.

Mr. Haste: I understand all of that. I just do not understand why you need a case worker.

Mr. Brown: What is your concern with that?

Mr. Haste: What is my concern? Wasting money. I do not really see how a case worker is going to fix the problem. To me, it is a matter of placement, identifying the person ahead of time and getting the courts to agree to sentence them that way. That happens now. I see it now. There is somewhat of a system in place now to do it. How is it being done now? I do not understand how one case worker is going to make that happen.

Mr. Brown: That one case worker is going to have all of their time focused on making sure all of this happens. Right now it is sort of half hazard. It may happen from the

District Attorney's Office, my office or Adult Probation. There has been no coordinated effort to work together.

Mr. Haste: Is this case worker going to be going into court and suggesting treatment and following up with placement?

Mr. Brown: If they get asked.

Mr. Haste: Why should they be asked?

Mr. Libhart: No.

Mr. Brown: If they get asked to be at court they will be there.

Mr. Libhart: They would have to submit a report on each one regardless. They may be asked to come to court for some questions on a particular issue. There will be a standard written report for each initial treatment assessment they do. The treatment plan will be stepped out and how it will be run. That person will be responsible for monitoring that from beginning to end.

Mr. Brown: Now people enter the criminal justice system and there are loose ends all the way around in terms of, and this is one reason why people end up back in prison. This initiative gets a chance to look at where the gaps are and where the coordination is and you start to look at it to build on that. That has not happened before.

Mr. Hartwick: How does the District Attorney's Office currently on levels 3 and 4 if they are in for drug offenses, don't you automatically refer them to Drugs & Alcohol for assessment?

Mr. Libhart: They can be assessed, but the majority of the treatment programs that necessarily will be provided to them unless they are court ordered there is no way to force the individual to participate in them.

Mr. Hartwick: At what point do you guys notify Drugs and Alcohol?

Mr. Brown: They send referrals to us all the time but like he said unless the person is court ordered to complete the program they can go in one day and leave the next day.

Mr. Haste: How is the case worker going to change that?

Mr. Brown: First there is going to be an order from the Courts.

Mr. Haste: This is done now by the Court.

Mr. Hartwick: Should be done now by the Court.

Mr. Brown: Sometimes it is, sometimes it is not.

Mr. Haste: How is this case worker going to make that happen?

Mr. Brown: They will follow the person's progress through the entire treatment program and after that...

Mr. Haste: That is after they are court ordered. We are talking now about getting them ordered.

Mr. Tully: If I may, from being on the sentencing commission where the intermediate punishment program was developed statewide, essentially it is a treatment option to the sentencing guidelines that was created. The intermediate punishment is something that otherwise would not be available but for the way it is set up in order to do that you must have a program in place that meets PCCD staffing requirements that allows the Courts to impose those intermediate punishment sentences. The problem has been we have not had the funding in place. When it first went through with great intentions from the General Assembly the funding was late in coming. The funding is coming from PCCD and Dauphin County is actually embarrassingly behind in getting there. We now have a President Judge who used to be on the sentencing commission as well and is committed to the Intermediate punishment program. Frankly, the staff person is the ticket in which the other \$450,000 for actual placement in the programs comes in. Essentially the court could say it but we didn't have the ability to do it within the guidelines until this program here. I admit that this program should have been here years ago but the courts couldn't do it until we had an approved intermediate punishment program in place. This is the funding that allows us to do what many of our sister counties have already done.

Mr. Hartwick: The PCCD grant runs out then the state puts this in place then asks us to be responsible for funding of the full time case worker. Does the money for funding for treatment and programs go away?

Mr. Tully: There is a commitment from the General Assembly that makes this an ongoing funding stream. It is critical to the success of the intermediate punishment program that the funding is there for the treatment. Before we had it in principal without the funding. There was no substance to it. The funding is what it is all about. The General Assembly is essentially going to have to maintain the funding for it to work. It must be done across the Board. They have continually funded it for the past five years. There has been more money available then has been claimed. We could have been doing this years ago but we simply didn't get a program in because there was not total agreement from the Bench to agree on the program. We now have the commitment from the bench. I would foresee based upon the Senators and Representatives on the commission that this is a long term commitment. They believe that is the only way they are going to answer not just county intermediate punishment but to take the pressure off of the state correctional institutions as well. This is a less expensive alternative to building more prisons and filling them with people that really need treatment.

Mr. Haste: I support the overall idea of the program. My frustration is that I have not been able to see why we need a case manager. I would rather see all of the money going into placement and have the case workers we have now pick up the duties.

Mr. Tully: They say you need to hire a person.

Mr. Haste: They do?

Mr. Tully: Yes.

Mr. Haste: I think if we go to them and say we are going to use all of the money for placement someone else is going to administer that. I would be surprised if they said; no this is also a job creation program.

Mr. Brown: They will not permit you to use those funds for existing staff.

Mr. Haste: We will not use them for existing staff. We will use them all for placement.

Mr. Brown: Then what happens is the turn around time on the process will be delayed.

Mr. Haste: Only because it is not a priority. Someone in your operations decided it is not a priority and you need more staff to do it. If it was a priority someone would already be doing that.

Mr. Brown: I have six people in there now and those six people work every day. It would be hard for me to take any of those six people out just to be dedicated to this criminal justice project without having something else be effected.

Mr. Haste: I will want to see an ongoing list of who is being kept out of prison.

Mr. Brown: I would be glad to provide updates.

Mr. Hartwick: I want to see a list of upcoming projects and what their expenditures are as it relates to our criminal justice system.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As part of the motion do you want to formally include some sort of reporting aspect to it?

Mr. Brown: I think you need to be aware of how effective the program is.

Mr. Haste: Will you make that in the motion?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I will in a time frame that is acceptable to us.

Mr. Brown: What does it cost right now to incarcerate a person?

Mr. Haste: \$58.00 per day unless they need medical care then it goes up to as high as \$64.00.

Mr. Brown: Treatment costs are half that when you look at incarceration costs vs. treatment.

Mr. Haste: That is what I said, to break even you need to show roughly 720 days worth of placement else where.

Mr. Brown: We are targeted to do 200 the first 8 months of the project.

Mr. Haste: You are telling me that you will have 200 people who would have gone to jail into placement somewhere else. So I can tell the Warden now that next month our population will drop down to 900.

Mr. Brown: These are level 3 or level 4 offenders. The prison seems a place that people like to go to.

Mr. Haste: Their food is so good that is why.

Mr. Brown: I do not think that you are going to free all of those beds. They will be filled up with violent offenders.

Mr. Haste: If you build it they will come.

Mr. Brown: The whole idea behind this initiative is to take as many people as you can and place them in treatment for six or twelve months. It is a cost savings to the county.

Mr. Haste: It is if we can reduce the population. The only way this works is if in fact we see numbers that drop. I would like you to tell me a year from now that the population dropped in half.

Mr. Brown: I can not guarantee you that the population will drop in half with this one initiative.

Mr. Haste: But you told me 200.

Mr. Brown: I can tell you this, we will divert out of the prison in eight months.

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to approve the submission of a Drug and Alcohol Restrictive Intermediate Punishment Grant to PCCD with the provisions that on a quarterly basis this Board receives a formal written report as to how the program is progressing and the numbers involved. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carries.

Mr. Brown: I can do a cost analysis for you and where people went.

SALARY BOARD

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

PERSONNEL

Ms. Fisher: There was an addendum to the personnel packet. There are nine transactions. I believe all of these have been approved by the oversight commissioner.

Mr. Haste: A number of these are from the Prison to get approved for the disaster relief leave. We have talked that there will not be more than two signed off by the Warden. Just to keep the numbers down we have a number of folks who are on a revolving call up due to the military and to allow more than two could cause us difficulty.

Ms. Fisher: The rest of the personnel packet stand as presented.

Mr. Hartwick made the motion to approve the Personnel Packet as amended. Mr. DiFrancesco seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carries.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: Since last week we had three additions to the packet and all were approved by the oversight Commissioner. They are on page 4, 22 and 23. All budget issues have been resolved since last week. Hopefully all of you received an email from Carolyn Thompson on how the court understands and how they are to manage their budget. She could not be here today.

Mr. Hartwick made the motion to approve the Purchase Order packet noting the stipulation on page 12, contingent upon the funds being transferred. Mr. DiFrancesco seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carries.

Mr. Baratucci: I have six Blackberry requests that did not the make the workshop. I gave each of you advanced copies. I need you to take a vote on them if possible. As preparation for the meeting I had Rob do a justification for each one of them. I have signed off on them. All of the individuals who have requested them have more or less 24/7 responsibilities. All of them tend to be out of the office quite a bit. I have signed off on the justification forms as oversight. D'Juna is here if there are any questions.

Mr. Haste: I just think the Blackberry craze is getting out of hand.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there anything related to their duties that they can't just be contacted by phone?

Mr. Haste: When I think about this, if there is one Department who need it, would probably be EMA. I don't like the way we are going with the Blackberry's but this is one I quite frankly would vote pro on because if any one is going to be wanting to get a hold of things, these are the guys we want to have them.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Under Dave Murdach's request he literally is the guy that when a tower site goes down in the middle of the night and he goes out and inspects and performs maintenance. Soon JNET will be available on these systems for hazardous material information. Just like the Public Defender's Office, is one that they are constantly out of their office for court, etc. And there is a reason why they need access to calendar and other information.

Mr. Hartwick: I won't support a Blackberry for anybody in the Public Defender's Office. The Board of Commissioners purchased their own Blackberry's with our own money, I am going to vote no on all Blackberry requests unless they want to pay on their own for them, then I would approve them.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I thought we set a policy on this and are going by that policy. I do not think the avalanche is coming on the Blackberry. I am not aware of any that we approved that people are not paying for them themselves.

Mr. Haste: I am directing this to Tom and Randy and a year from now we will probably have requests for notebooks. If we create a policy for the new toy then the old toy needs to go away. We need to just be cautious.

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to approve EMA's request for Blackberry. Mr. Haste seconded the motion. Mr. Haste and Mr. DiFrancesco were in favor. Commissioner Hartwick is not in favor. Motion carries.

REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – Greg Schneider

Report from the Office of Budget & Finance October 19, 2005

- **October 7, 2005** transferred **\$292,759.66** to the **Payables** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **October 14, 2005** transferred **\$5,090,289.19** to the **Payables** account and **\$1,830,635.93** 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 \$125,380.79 rate 3.610%**

- **Balance today in Community Banks investment account \$24,000,160.64 rate 3.970%**
(This rate equals today's Fed Funds Rate of 3.750% plus 22 basis points)
- **Balance today in Commerce Bank investment account \$12,052,407.00 rate 4.135%** (This rate equals today's 91-day T-Bill rate of 3.785% plus 35 basis points)
- **Balance today in Sovereign Bank investment account \$12,000,094.24 rate 3.640%** (This rate is fixed through 10/31/05)

\$10M TRAN Line-of-Credit Status at PNC: No activity to date.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The majority of dollars are in the account that is not offering the highest date.

Mr. Schneider: Commerce's rate is a T-Bill rate which gets updated daily.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Are we tracking month-to-month to insure the average interest rate is definitely the best one.

Mr. Schneider: No.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think we should be tracking this. I think we have a good investment system.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: You shouldn't be receiving any Blackberry requests from my self or your Solicitor because we are scared of them.

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

Mr. Tully: Nothing to add, but I would be happy to answer any questions.

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

Mr. Haste: Is there anything that needs to be pulled out separately or discussed?
(There was none.)

Mr. Hartwick made the motion to approve Items A through T. Mr. DiFrancesco seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carries.

- A. Training Packet
- B. Approval of FY05/06 Per Diem Rates between Children & Youth Agency and:
 - 1. New Passage Court Testimony \$63.00/hr

2.	Cornell Abraxas Group Inc. In-Home Family Counseling	\$197.68/session
3.	Holy Family Social Services Group Homes/Apartments Intensive Treatment Residential Treatment RTF-clothing & sundries RTF-MA approved room & bd. RTF-non MA treatment, rm. & bd.	\$156.59/day \$179.90/day \$167.75/day \$2.60/day \$ 46.14/day \$206.89/day
4.	Best Nest, Inc. Adopt/Personal Care-Maximum Foster Family Care-level I Foster Family Care-level II Foster Family Care-level III Foster Family Care-M/B Foster Family Care-M/B (2B) Foster Family Care-M/B (3B) Foster Family Care – HIV Foster Family Care – MED	\$75.00/month \$36.87/day \$48.28/day \$55.70/day \$59.79/day \$80.36/day \$102.11/day \$ 36.87/day \$ 36.87/day

C. Real estate tax refunds/exonerations:

1. Refund of 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004 real estate taxes
Margaret Masters, c/o John Feichtel, Keefer Wood Allen & Rahal, LLP,
Attorneys at Law, 210 Walnut St., P. O. Box 11963, Harrisburg,
Middle Paxton Township, Fishing Creek Valley, parcel 43-034-035,
in the amt. of \$717.61.

- D. Exacutrack Service Agreement between Adult Probation and BI Incorporated for the Electronic Monitoring units.
- E. Pharmacy Services Agreement between Spring Creek and PharMerica, Inc. to provide pharmacy services at Spring Creek.
- F. Space Rental Agreement between Parks & Recreation and PA Department of Agriculture for the 2006 PA Farm Show.
- G. Approval of Release and Participation in the Class Action Settlement against the Arthur J. Gallagher & Co. (Personnel)
- H. Purchase of Service Agreement between Information Techonology and Trebron Co., Inc. for the Sophos Anti-Virus Software.
- I. Purchase of Service Agreement for FY05/06 between Children & Youth Agency and Kidspace National Centers of Pennsylvania, Inc.
- J. Amendment#2 to FY05/06 Purchase of Service Agreement between Children & Youth Agency and Keystone Service Systems, Inc. t/d/b/a Keystone Children and Family Services.
- K. CWEL Agreement between Children & Youth Agency and the University of Pittsburgh for CYS Employee Casey L. Dando.
- L. Agreement for Secure Detention and Shelter Services between Schaffner Youth Center and Children & Youth Agency.

- M. Purchase of Service Agreements for FY05/06 between Mental Health/Mental Retardation and:
 - 1. Keystone Community Resources, Inc.
 - 2. Community Service Group, Inc.
 - 3. Wyoming Valley Professional Ambulance Services, Inc.

- N. Emergency Shelter Grant Agreement between Mental Health/Mental Retardation and Shalom House.

- O. Amendments to Purchase of Service Agreements between Mental Health/ Mental Retardation and:
 - 1. Aurora Social Rehabilitation Services, Inc.
NEE The "Aurora Club" – Amendment #1 FY04/05
 - 2. Aurora Social Rehabilitation Services, Inc.
NEE The "Aurora Club" – Amendment #1 FY05/06

- P. Approval of a Stipulation that approves the market value amount for the Tax Assessment Appeal of the Susquehanna Center, Inc., Tax Parcel No. 11-006-017.

- Q. Fire Alarm Maintenance Agreement between Dauphin County Solid Waste Department and ESCO, Inc., for the fire alarm system installed at the Dauphin County Recycling Facility.

- R. Approval to amend the Special Counsel Petition for William J. Flannery and Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP to continue to provide Special Counsel services with Post & Schell, P.C. Mr. Flannery has transferred from Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP to Post & Schell, P.C.

- S. Approval of final payment to Morgan Lewis & Bockius, LLP in the amt. of \$5,891.47 for employee policy.

- T. Creation of a Continuum of Care Blueprint Steering Committee in partnership with the City of Harrisburg as recommended by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines and appointment of the following individuals to said committee:
 - 1. Edward Trask
 - 2. Timothy F. Whelan
 - 3. Daniel Eisenhauer
 - 4. Mike Weisberg
 - 5. Deborah Clayton
 - 6. Bryan K. Davis
 - 7. Rev. James D. Brown
 - 8. Richard Evans
 - 9. Carter Nash
 - 10. Kirk Reider
 - 11. George Payne
 - 12. Jacquelyn L. Morrison
 - 13. Rosemary Browne
 - 14. Robert A. Scott, PhD
 - 15. Dr. David Hietala
 - 16. Maria E. Chianos, MSW
 - 17. Jodi Silliker
 - 18. Rev. Brenda Alton

FORMER BUSINESS

(There were none.)

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Hartwick: Recently at the 10th Anniversary of the Rutherford House, they made a ceremonial payment for the lease in the amount of one gold dollar. I would like to make that transfer to the Treasurer.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

(There was none.)

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Haste: You see the items of correspondence received by the Board lettered A through G that will be handled by the staff appropriately.

- A. Notification from Buchart Hon, Inc., on behalf of Kenneth Gall, Director of Real Estate for the Hershey Trust Company, indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP for a general NPDES permit for the purposes of a new entrance drive off of Bullfrog Valley Road for a new building, the Hershey Center for Applied Research, and associated parking.
- B. Notification from TeamAg Incorporated indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP for a general permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction of two barns located due west of the intersection of Mill Road and Hill Road in Conewago Township, Dauphin County.
- C. Notification from Planning Principles, LLC, on behalf of Saint Catherine Laboure School, indicating they submitted a Safe Routes to School Grant application to PennDOT.
- D. Notification from Penn Terra Engineering, Inc., indicating that Magnolia Terrace Partners, L.P, intends to apply to DEP for a general NPDES permit for stormwater associated with construction activities at the site of Magnolia Terrace located in Susquehanna Township, Dauphin County.
- E. Notification from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc., indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP in reference to the Rabbit Lane culvert replacement located Rabbit Lane crossing of Walnut Run, West Hanover Township, Dauphin County.
- F. Notification from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc., indicating they intend to submit an application to DEP in reference to Kiwanis Road culvert replacement located Kiwanis Road crossing Walnut Run, West Hanover Township, Dauphin County.
- G. Received a copy of the draft Multi-Creek Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan from the Dauphin County Conservation District. (Beaver, Manada and Bow Creeks and Kellock Run watersheds.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(There was none.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. DiFrancesco made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Hartwick seconded the motion. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

Transcribed by: Kacey Truax
printed 1/27/06