



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

APRIL 9, 2008

10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

Jeff Haste, Chairman (ABSENT)

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Marie E. Rebuck, Controller; Janis Creason, Treasurer; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; J. Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; Jack Lotwick, Sheriff; Chuck Sheaffer, Sheriff's Office; Melissa Wion, Personnel; Amy Richards, Commissioners' Office; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Mitch Baylarian, Solicitor's Office; Matt Davies, Solid Waste Department; Steve Libhart, District Attorney's Office; Tom Guenther, Director of IT; Kay Lengle, Personnel; Josiah Frederick, Commissioners' Office; David Mattern, Children & Youth; Diane McNaughton, Commissioners' Office; Leila McAdoo, Solicitor's Office; Dan Robinson, Director of Community & Economic Development; Faye Fisher, Director of Personnel; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Brenda Hoffer, Commissioners' Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Garry Lenton, Steve Hetrick, Dave Walters and Paul Carter

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have three sets of meeting minutes that we will be taking up at next week's meeting, the March 26, 2008 Workshop Meeting, the April 2, 2008 Legislative Meeting and the April 2, 2008 Salary Board Meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. DiFrancesco: We are at the point in time on the Agenda for public participation. Is there anybody that would like to address the Board? (There was none.)

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Dominic D. DiFrancesco, II, Commissioner

1. Proclamation – County Government Week

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have the first public presentation today. I'm going to laugh, because at one point this may seem like a self-promoting Proclamation. But at the same time, it is a very important Proclamation because oftentimes people really truly don't understand what County government is all about. One of the initiatives that our National trade association does is each year they promote the idea of having a week to celebrate County government in a way that you can actually promote what is going on and that is what this Proclamation is in regards to. As I'm reading this, I want everybody to be very much aware that we are talking about people here. We are talking about a number of employees who serve every day to make Dauphin County a better place. I'll simply read the Proclamation.

Office of County Commissioner

Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Proclamation

We, the Dauphin County Board of Commissioners, are proud to join with the nation's 3,066 counties that provide a variety of essential public services to communities serving 300 million Americans in declaring April 6 through 12 as "National County Government Week, "Protecting Our Children";

Whereas, counties take seriously their responsibility to protect and enhance the health, welfare and safety of its residents in prudent and cost-effective ways;

Whereas, when children are at-risk or victimized, counties often serve as the safety net, providing critical supports for families at their time of need; we join with the 67 counties in Pennsylvania to spotlight the ways in which county governments work to protect the safety and well-being of children;

Whereas, sadly, more than 500,000 children are in foster care, removed from their families as a result of suspected abuse or neglect; to respond to needs in Dauphin County, the Office of Children in Youth and its dedicated, caring staff work diligently to ensure children are in safe, nurturing environments;

Whereas, first celebrated in 1991, National County Government Week was created to increase public awareness regarding the roles and responsibilities of the nation's counties in hopes that citizens better understand how counties respond to the needs of families and communities;

Whereas, the National Association of Counties is the only national organization that represents and advocates on behalf of county governments in the United States;

Therefore, in recognition of the leadership, innovation and valuable service provided by the nation's counties, especially in the protection and welfare of children, that we proclaim April 6 through 12, 2008 as "National County Government Week" in Dauphin County; we give a special thanks to the many county employees who intervene on behalf of children; and we urge the community at large to join together to combat this agonizing social crisis and provide our children with safe, secure homes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Many of you have sat through times in the past where we have actually brought employees in and recognized them. Last week we brought in a number of our employees. In fact, these jobs, the 1600 plus people that work for Dauphin County, many of them work in very professional careers carrying a heavy burden in that what they see on a day-to-day basis they take home with them. You may not be at your desk working, but you carry the burden of seeing these children who in a lot of cases are living in very bad environments. As I mentioned many people in the community don't realize what the responsibilities of County government are and hopefully many of them don't understand that for a very good reason – they never had to get involved with the services provided by the County. We do have a challenge in our community as in so many communities across the country – families are breaking down. The result of that is the increase in violence, the increase in loss of life and respect for life that we see in so many of our communities, and at some point it has to end. Counties and their employees across the country are the advocates that can raise those issues, raise that awareness and really try to fight back in giving the supports necessary to raise kids in a safe environment and try to restore the family in America and put us back on the right track. With that we can move on.

We are going to skip Item B on the Agenda. That will be moved to next week.

B. George Hartwick, III, Commissioner

1. Proclamation – National Victim Rights Week (Next week)

C. Paul Carter, Senior Account Executive, Noresco

1. Energy Efficiency Assessment

Mr. Cohen: Matt Davies and I, we have been talking for a couple weeks now with Paul Carter from Noresco. He basically is doing an energy savings on all the County buildings. Basically we are trying to do a money savings, a guaranteed energy savings. Mr. Carter is here to explain the process. Hopefully next week we will be able to get permission to have an RFP put out to the 18 vendors that are selected by the State for this funding, which Paul Carter will hit on.

Mr. Carter: The program is called the “Pennsylvania Guaranteed Energy Savings Program”. The enabling legislation is Act 77, Title 62 and it is a program whereby counties, state government and school districts from around the State are able to implement energy savings programs in the facilities in a paid from savings manner. We looked at your facilities and have come across some significant savings opportunities that we want to outline for you today for your consideration.

The program is 100% paid from savings and that is significant in that you already have the funding. It is in your existing utility budget. So, the improvements that may be implemented would be funded 100% from the savings. It has to be measured and verified. It is a public bid situation and the contracts are amortized over 15 years to make the improvements. The vendor that is awarded the contract has to guarantee in writing the savings. If the savings do not occur then the contractor writes the county a check for the difference in the improvements. The program benefits largely our no out-of-pocket costs to the county. So, you are making improvements from your existing utility budget. It is looking at water conservation, gas, electricity and operational savings throughout. It is a one-source type of a contract where the engineering and the construction management is under one contract and that makes it somewhat easier to manage. Again, the additional value is your leadership has already been pretty well explained and I want to compliment you for your recycling program and the ads that I see on TV in moving that forward. This is sort of a follow-up on that same agenda to save energy and become good stewards of the environment.

These are the types of improvements that are typically implemented in a program from boiler upgrades, lighting, water conservation, roofs, variable speed drives and solar. Depending on the applications and the economics, you, in the end, have the decision as to how it works.

Mr. Hartwick: Last year during budget talks and when Edgar took me up to the roof to see a project that was going on, we actually talked about the idea of utilizing the space on the top of all county buildings to try to bring in some kind of solar energy and additional green powers. Is this project something that is going to help us identify what

is possible, talk about what the capital costs would be and the long term benefits? I think we should certainly model and be an example for trying to promote energy efficiency particularly in light of what is happening in our economy and with the energy situation around the United States. We should figure out a way to be efficient here first before we allow our communities to follow suit. Let's take a look at all of those possibilities based upon our space. Is that an analysis that you are going to try to perform within this study?

Mr. Carter: Yes, that is a common technology that would be evaluated. Oftentimes it makes sense or it helps to have grant money that is available through the State Department of Environmental Protection that subsidizes that technology.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm all for finding other money for it, but I think when you talk to the Board, we are certainly willing to take a look at what those costs would be versus what the long term benefits would be and also what the immediate impact would be to the environment, and do an evaluation to see if we are going to put some money into that from our side. I think it is an investment this Board stands willing and ready to make.

Mr. Cohen: That study will be performed at the Courthouse, the Human Services Building and the Veterans Memorial Building in looking at solar panels.

Mr. Hartwick: Don't forget about the Prison and Schaffner Center to look at all the buildings to see how you can maximize energy efficiency. If solar panels become the best way to improve that, how we can do that with every county asset?

Mr. Carter: That is the nature of this program, a full-blown audit of all of the opportunities and bringing back a detailed report.

Mr. Hartwick: Not to get you off track here, but the detail report will come back as you stated and will talk about other ways that we can find revenue to be able to support what the recommendations from your group are going to be?

Mr. Carter: That is what the program is about. We have a graph that shows how you are operating the building now and that represents your utility budget, gas, electric and water and what you are spending now. During the program typically the savings are 25% of the total utility budget. The majority of that goes to pay for the debt service during that period and then after all of the savings goes to the county directly. That is how the program is paid for. Is that clear? We found in some of your buildings, the Administration Building here is in pretty good shape. We believe there is some simultaneous heating and cooling going on with the district steam and chilled water that can be adjusted. The hot water temperature is pretty high. There is some water conservation within the building, domestic and some energy management upgrades with how you control your HVAC and your Libert units in your computer room and possibly some sensors for lighting and so forth. What we found in the Courthouse is a good bit more opportunity from a dollar perspective. There are obviously lighting upgrades throughout and domestic water conservation. You have a number of air

handlers that need to be replaced. They are beyond their useful life. This is a way to fund those improvements, maybe take them off your capital list. I don't know. Energy efficiency in the windows there is obviously a good opportunity to replace windows. New direct digital control that controls the thermostat system and some of the pictures here include the lighting, windows and your condensation return is going down the drain. That can be harnessed for energy. There are improvements that increase the quality of air in the building as well. The lights at the Courthouse are incandescent for that skylight. The jail has significant opportunities. That is a big energy consumer so there are a lot of opportunities there in lighting and water conservation. We understand that the jail is spending between \$600,000 and \$700,000 a year on water and sewer. So, there is a huge opportunity, in our opinion, there. We will find out what it is and quantify that for you. Boiler replacements, water handlers and again domestic water upgrades. Those are the samplings of what we found in your facilities.

Mr. Hartwick: The whole system, boilers, the HVAC system within the Dominic D. DiFrancesco building as well, has that been included in your study?

Mr. Cohen: If we get the go-ahead next week to do an RFP it will be all the county-owned buildings. It will be engineers coming in and going through the building and then they would come back with a cost breakdown, how much savings, etc. and then we would pick from that group as to what would benefit the county the best. If we decide to move ahead then we would award that RFP to that certain contractor.

Mr. Hartwick: The question was is that building included in the study?

Mr. Cohen: All the county buildings, yes.

Mr. Carter: Based on your utilities this is a sample cash flow of what the project might look like with your savings on the left and then there is a green column in there for energy efficiency certificates. That is a new opportunity that will actually generate revenue for the county in selling certificates in effect to utilities who need to produce so much electricity in a renewable manner or efficient manner by the year 2010 or they get penalized. This is a way to generate revenue for the county. The debt service payment is in the middle and then the positive cash flow resulting from the project. Most all of these projects are financed with a municipal lease so that the savings stream is directly tied to the payment stream.

Mr. Hartwick: I can't see this chart. This is an important one.

Mr. Carter: I have some handouts.

Mr. Hartwick: How did you come up with the numbers on this particular spreadsheet? Were they based upon the buildings that you had shown us and the assets that were included and what it would take to replace them? Those specific ones or is this going to expand as the look expands?

Mr. Carter: This is a tentative look based on a review of the few buildings that we did and looking at your utility budget as a whole. This does not represent the exact costs and the exact savings of a project we have identified. It's a more or less hypothetical based on your utility budget. We basically take the utility bills as the baseline for what type of project can be generated from that and then depending on whether it is water conservation, windows, solar or lighting, it is usually a combination of things that come out of this program. This is a hypothetical example to show you the payments and the savings that are typical in a project of this size.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So when the engineering study gets done and they come back is that when we will have hard numbers, the one that would require the contractor to write us a check?

Mr. Carter: That is correct.

Mr. Hartwick: It is going to be a very important chart.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is the number that I am curious as to how it gets constructed, because obviously you are in a highly changing environment where electric rates are changing and everything is changing so over a 15 year period how do you know whether or not you accomplished your goals or not when the variables constantly change?

Mr. Carter: Right.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is it structured in a way that merely makes it impossible for them not to meet their goals?

Mr. Carter: It is tricky and the way that is done is through measurement and verification of the end use equipment.

Mr. Hartwick: We have to agree on how you perform the measurements and everything. We have had frustrations with measuring energy savings with other companies that have claimed that they wanted reimbursement for the amount of savings and there has always been a discrepancy between what we said was actual savings versus what they were claiming as reimbursement. We need to be clear on the evaluation tool and have a common understanding of what we are expecting from the outcomes prior to us entering. Is that how you engage contractually?

Mr. Carter: Here are some reasons why you would want to consider a program now. You may be aware, per the Pennsylvania Utility Commission, the rate caps are coming off on the electric companies so there is going to be some significant increases in electricity. So, the value of the conservation is greater in future years. The energy efficiency certificates are another cash flow that's an opportunity. Grants that maybe are available for some of the other technologies, the good public relations benefits from the program and again it addresses your deferred maintenance. There is no money out

of the capital budget or out of your general fund, if you will. It is using the existing utility budget to fund the program. That allows you to use your capital for other possible things.

Mr. Hartwick: Can you just explain that to me? The utility savings that are going to be provided as a result of this program are going to be used to offset any capital expenditures is what the claim is and are used to pay all the professional services in this particular project.

Mr. Carter: That is correct.

Mr. Hartwick: And that is allowable through this enabling legislation?

Mr. Carter: That is correct.

The typical project steps include a facility scope, if you will, whereby you issue an expression of interest to the sixteen vendors that are pre-qualified with the Department of General Services. That would include a profile of your facilities and your utility data. Then, you would select three firms, based on those qualifications, to come in and do a complete audit. We also recommend that you hire a Noresco consulting engineer to help you review the proposals, because as you alluded to they are quite technical and how the measurement verification is determined is important. So, I would recommend that you hire a consultant to review that and advise you along the way. From those three vendors you would issue the RFP and that is already pre-done through the Department of General Services. They have standard letters of interest, standard RFPs and standard contract documents that are available for you to use. Then you would have a proposal meeting laying out the guidelines on how to move forward and then the proposal audit period would be quite detailed. This is where the engineers would be combing over each piece of equipment and each opportunity in coming back with exact costs and savings for each energy conservation measure. Those proposals are quite involved and then you would select your preferred vendor, if you will, and in turn do the final audit, final engineering, execute the contract and get the contract implemented.

Mr. Hartwick: I like that word guaranteed savings. That is one that we heard quite a few times but have never seen.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We just have to make sure that it is guaranteed savings.

Mr. Carter: This is a sampling of the firms that are pre-qualified on the DGS list. Here are some of the projects around the area that we have been involved in such as the Rachel Carson Building is a project that we were awarded recently and even though it is a young building there is still significant opportunities. The Governor's Residence is another project that we have implemented locally. Other projects include several state prisons, Camp Hill, Rockview, several of the State universities such as Millersville, Kutztown, Cheyney and several county governments as well. This is a sampling of the county governments that have implemented projects and on the right are the counties

that are implementing them currently. It is not something that is new. It has been proven over time through various experiences. This legislation has been out and has been updated over several years.

Mr. Hartwick: So, how did it take so long for you to get to us?

Mr. Carter: That is a good question. We try to implement opportunities as we see and approach folks and educate. Allegheny County is one of the projects that we implemented back when the legislation was for only ten years. It was almost \$10 million worth of improvements, a little more than \$1.4 in savings and that was county-wide through their youth detention center, the jails, parks and county office buildings. So it is a very comprehensive program. (He showed some pictures.) If you have any questions I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Hartwick: I don't mean my comments to be centered towards you. We just had a number of folks who have moved forward with similar energy type of conservation efforts that have made some more promises and their ability to deliver has been less than what the expectations of the Board and staff has been. I believe this is absolutely something that we need to explore. The first question is, your company Noresco, how are you involved in the business and who would be your competition out there trying to educate counties in the same way that you are?

Mr. Carter: This is the list here of all the pre-qualified vendors. You may recognize many already. These are the firms that have been pre-qualified by the State of Pennsylvania for the Department of General Services program.

Mr. Cohen: Noresco would go out to all of them.

Mr. Hartwick: Take me through this process. Whoever would be selected from this RFP would then be doing the overall evaluation of all the county facilities and selecting subcontractors to do the actual technical part of the evaluation. You would be like the construction manager in this particular effort.

Mr. Carter: We are mostly engineers and project managers. Yes, we would have a team of electrical, mechanical specialists, water specialists and lighting specialists coming through your facilities. The process that I described is you would select three short-listed firms that are most qualified out of this list to come in and do a detailed audit, detailed proposal. Those three proposals would come to you and your selection team, along with your consultant, would review them and come back and have an oral interview where you would ask questions and get your answers. Then you would select the vendor based on that whole process. It is quite involved and quite detailed.

Mr. Hartwick: To select the consultant is that something that we need to do before we put out the RFP?

Mr. Carter: I would suggest right about that time, yes.

Mr. Hartwick: Then the way we would contract either with the consultant or the actual company who will be doing the work that would be based upon... How do you normally contract in these cases? Is it a fee-for-service contract or is it something that is based upon the ability to have and to measure those savings? What is your normal contractual relationship?

Mr. Carter: There is no cost or contract until you have selected a vendor. Then those costs are all, it is one large project cost. We act as a general contractor in effect. We get paid for installing the whole system, all of the various subprojects that comprise that package if you will.

Mr. Hartwick: That would be based upon the scope and the total size of the project and you would receive a percentage or would it be on the back end side as it relates to the savings?

Mr. Carter: No, it is not as a percentage. We get paid to install the equipment like a general contractor. We get paid from the leasing company in effect on a draw schedule and your payments wouldn't start until after the savings are incurred.

Mr. Hartwick: Your company or would we be dealing with subcontractors or our county staff to do the installation?

Mr. Carter: No, it is all turnkey, one vendor, one contract. They manage all the subs, the engineering and the guarantee, the whole nine yards.

Mr. Hartwick: So, I won't see Edgar with a sweatband around his head installing any chillers is what you are telling me?

Mr. Carter: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: It would all be done in one shot.

Mr. Carter: Nine month construction period, rather quick.

Mr. Hartwick: Would that include any other things that you would be recommending related to other energy efficient things?

Mr. Carter: Typically it is a list of 30 or 40 sub-projects or maybe 20 sub-projects depending on how we lay it out for each building. Each one would have a cost, a savings and a pay back.

Mr. Hartwick: You guys obviously know what best practices have been in other locations so we will have an opportunity to meet with Facility Maintenance to be able to describe what the Commissioners think may be important parts of the project before you come up with the whole idea. You guys may be looking at what is the biggest bang for

the buck in order to do some installations for energy savings and we may want to make some investments in other areas where it may not look like a significant amount of savings, but there may be some energy conservation and some other things that may occur as a result.

Mr. Carter: You have total control over the scope of work in the end. Sometimes counties add capital money to the program to buy down a certain project or technology so that can be done as well. We try to do it all paid from savings, but if there is an additional investment or additional project that the commissioners want to put into the project that can be done.

Mr. Hartwick: Edgar, who do you envision as our project team?

Mr. Cohen: We will have a team together, Matt Davies and I of course are steering it, but we will add to the team. We are looking to add Dave Coldren from the Prison, Chad or someone from the Commissioners' Office. Then when the reports come in that is when we will go through it with our engineer to find out what is best for the County as in what is the most savings. Once we decide that then we will bring it back to the commissioners.

Mr. Hartwick: Can I just make some recommendations as to the other people that you should have on the team? You should have Randy Baratucci involved and Mike Yohe.

Mr. Cohen: Those are the obvious ones, yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I honestly don't feel that the Director of IT has enough on his plate either that he should probably be involved in that as well. I think I'll volunteer him.

Mr. Hartwick: Do you envision a representative from each one of the facilities that we are talking about and obviously the right County staff and a representative from the Commissioners' Office to define how this is going to work out? Prior to us executing, you are looking for us to do it this week or next week?

Mr. Cohen: Next week to allow us to send out the information to the companies.

Mr. Saylor: I think we do already have a copy of the proposal and I think it is on the Solicitor's report. Barring no problems that come up from the review, we should have it ready for a vote next week.

Mr. Hartwick: And we can give some input over the next week as to expectations. I think this is an important project.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The only comment I had was one that Commissioner Hartwick already mentioned and that is that we make sure that whoever is involved in flushing this out contact us, because there may be other things that we want to go further on depending on what technology is out there and what the expected return would be. I

know we are all looking at solar as a possible option, but we are not sure where the technology is right now and what the costs and recovery are and so forth. I just don't want the staff involved to assume that they know where we are. We want to make certain that they are communicating with the Commissioners to know exactly how far we want to go. I think all of us are very much concerned about this initiative and moving it forward in a timely manner, but also making sure that we capture all the opportunities of the current market.

Mr. Hartwick: Quite frankly as the expert, if you could throw out from things that you have seen, all of the options and we will talk about making some recommendations as to what you think are the most energy efficient, what could be the best investment and what environmentally would be some of the best things you can do, but may not save the most money, but may do some good things for the environment. We are not experts in that area. I think we have the right intentions, but we need some help from an expertise side to really understand what is out there, what technologies are out there and where we are going to go with any kind of capital investment. We will be looking at our experts to make that kind of recommendation. So, from the most energy efficient to the least and in-between let us know what is out there.

Mr. Carter: That is exactly how we hope to serve you. We have software that allows you to pick and choose various sub-projects and then you can see directly the financial impact of the whole deal by selecting or de-selecting various sub-projects. We want you to be involved in that process, because it is your buildings and budgets. We are just the team to help you get there.

Mr. Hartwick: I think the message that you are hearing from Nick and I is this is not about the amount of savings we are providing...

Mr. DiFrancesco: Good stewards as well.

Mr. Hartwick: And talk about the most energy efficient stuff as well.

Mr. Carter: That would include your recycling programs and various aspects of that.

Mr. Hartwick: Whatever recommendations you can make to help that.

Mr. Saylor: May I just add a couple points? Mr. Tully just pointed out to me that we apparently do not have a copy of anything so if there is an agreement or something that we need to have the Board approve, we need to get that as soon as possible.

Mr. Cohen: I can give you the Act. That is what we are going off of.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think the Solicitor's response is it may not be. Again, if we are expected to vote on this next week, which we would like to do, we want to make sure we have our questions answered and input given.

Mr. Cohen: I will get with the Solicitor's Office.

Mr. Saylor: Either Edgar or Matt should talk with some of the other counties that are listed here and check to see what their experiences have been with this program and also it might be good for the Commissioners to see if the target is not so much a focus on dollars as it is usage. Perhaps you may have already done this, but can we get a breakdown of how much water is being used out at the Prison over the last year or two or five and how much electricity? That might be good for us to have.

Mr. Cohen: When the vendor comes in that is what they will do. They will then bring it back to us.

Mr. Saylor: I think we are capable of doing that ourselves.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We had two water main breaks out there in the past year. Weren't there two?

Mr. Cohen: There were two.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Obviously the water usage in the past year is not going to be reflective of...

Mr. Cohen: This last one was not a charge against us. It was actually the water company.

Mr. Hartwick: How the water is coming out of the showers, etc. needs to be evaluated.

Mr. Carter: There is technology out there that actually increases the security as well in terms of not allowing any flushes by pushing one button and controlling the whole Prison and limiting the showers with the amount of time. There is a lot of technology that we've employed in many prisons already. We know what works and what does not.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Excellent.

D. Stephen Hetrick

- 1. New Contract**
- 2. Investment Policy Statement**

Mr. Hetrick: We are here today to review some of the recommendations that were approved by the Voluntary Employee Benefits Committee. You should have before you a binder that has the executive summary in Section 1. It details what is covered as far as the new contract and the update to the Investment Policy Statement is in Section 2. In Section 3 we have two additional new funds that were added to the investment line-up. What I would like to do is quickly go over the executive summary.

I would like to start by introducing Dave Walters. Dave will be the back-up consultant. Dave and I recently formed a registered investment advisory company, Retirement Collaborative, which is registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I made that move and moved away from my past affiliation with NFP Securities, Inc.; which was a broker dealer and also an investment advisor. We had an investment advisory contract with NFP. What I wanted to do is move to more of a fee based model completely instead of having anything to do with commissions so I could come in and no matter who I was dealing with I could say without a fact I am dealing with them on a fiduciary basis. Whenever you are dealing with somebody as a fiduciary you are putting their interests first. In that older relationship being a broker dealer, as well as an investment advisor, there was always that in the background. When you are dealing with somebody as a broker dealer as a registered rep they only have a suitability requirement, which means they need to provide a suitable investment. The suitable investment may not be the best investment out there, but when you are dealing with somebody on a fiduciary basis they have to put your interests first. That was really where I was coming from with making that change.

You have before you in Section 1 the New Investment Contract, which I believe has been reviewed and approved by the Solicitor's Office. Having the new contract and being able to control that allowed us to reduce the fees. That is all in the contract there. One thing I preach is risk management, both on the investment side of things and also on the business practice side. That is why Dave is aware of everything that is going on so if something should happen to me you have a local backup advisor. Also, should something happen to both of us we have an affiliation with an investment advisory firm in Boston that could step in and pick up the pieces and then do an RFP for local servicing for the participants. I think we have that covered well in the risk management side of things.

Because there is a new contract the old firm was listed in the Investment Policy Statement. One, the Investment Policy Statement needed to be updated. If you turn to the beginning of Section 2, the Investment Policy Statement is the business plan for the investments of the deferred compensation plan. I'm sure you are familiar. You have one for the pension fund that you are also on the Board for. This is specific to the deferred compensation plan. First we needed to change the company name from Charles River Collaborative to Retirement Collaborative. I should point out that with the change of the investment advisory firm; I think it is always important to have the least amount of impact to the planned participants. The only change that the plan participants will notice is that the name has changed from Charles River Collaborative to Retirement Collaborative. I tried to keep those names similar so that there would be little disruption. My phone numbers will stay the same, but the address has changed from downtown out to Linglestown Road. With the plan design the way it is, it's an open architecture type of plan similar to your defined benefit plan. If you changed actuaries it wouldn't affect the overall plan structure or the investments that are in there. We have that same model now with the deferred compensation plan. If you changed administrators, investment advisors, the funds, it doesn't have an affect on the other

components within the plan. It is very efficient and we are able to implement that with a lower cost structure than the more bundled and restrictive plan designs.

The second change on the Investment Policy Statement is the responsibilities. What we have done is we have detailed more our responsibilities...

Mr. Hartwick: Where would that be at in this report?

Mr. Hetrick: Section 2, part 2. What we have done is we outlined our responsibilities very specifically. What we have done by doing that is created more of a liability for ourselves, because if we don't do those we will be held liable for them. I think it is important to outline exactly what we are doing and what our responsibilities are. It was more vague in the last Investment Policy Statement, but it is very detailed here.

We've also updated the VEBC's role and the Commissioners' role. Your role as it stands and as it stood before was you are the plan administrators, which means that you were ultimately responsible for approving any of the recommendations and changes. But, you have the Voluntary Employee Benefits Committee out there to provide the more day-to-day oversight and come to you when there are recommendations, changes or if you need to be notified of things going on within the plan. That is outlined in the Investment Policy Statement.

The investment selection process has been detailed more. That is a little bit more rigorous than what it was before. There are going to be certain situations where what is outlined in the Investment Policy Statement might be a little bit too rigorous, which means it might be too restrictive in selecting investments that we could come up with a screen where there's no funds that meet that requirement. So what we would do is we would back off on some of the restrictions to find the very best one there. That happened when we were going through the merging markets, which we will talk about adding a merging market fund. We had to adjust the standard deviation. Having that more restrictive one and then being able to back off would be good. There are going to be other categories where you do a screen and come up with 30 different funds that are approved. So, how do you select out of 30? It is better to be more restrictive on that. That is in the investment selection that has been updated and also the monitoring of investments. It is important when you have an Investment Policy Statement that you are following through on it.

Mr. Hartwick: Does that investment selection process limit your flexibility or the participants' flexibility?

Mr. Hetrick: It's with a selection of a fund that would be included in the plan. When that would occur is when we are adding a new asset class, like what we will come to on our third recommendation or if we are replacing an existing investment that is under performing, has been on the watch list and has been placed for removal. We did that recently, back in September, with a couple funds. We go through this investment selection process to find, it's a new manager's search. It's the manager's search

process and you want to have the criteria. What we have done we had that more rigorous criteria for selecting them and then we have a caveat that if they don't meet the selections we will back down from some of those criteria; like you need to be in the top 25% in 1-year, 3-year or 5-year returns, your Alpha, your sharp ratio needs to be in the top 25% and so on. There is going to be some that don't meet all the requirements. Whenever you are, like I said, having the monitoring process you need to be following that. What we have done is we've lined up the monitoring criteria exactly in line with the investment reports that we are using, the quarterly monitoring reports. So, not only are they listed on the Investment Policy Statement, but then they are reiterated on the quarterly monitoring reports. So that we can assure that we are following those criteria, because it is important that if they are in writing and you say you are going to do this you need to make sure that you are doing it and be able to document that it has been done. We also have provided for the Voluntary Employee Benefits Committee a 3-year schedule of actions that need to be taken, again so that we make sure that everything that is in the Investment Policy Statement will be carried out in the future. If you want to go into more detail and see what the old Investment Policy Statement looked like relative to the new one, we have both of those in there, right after the summary.

Mr. Hartwick: Can you just go over the larger changes, unless Nick wants to go through the detail? Scott did a good job of advising on this.

Mr. Hetrick: Referring back to the executive summary in the beginning, on Page 2, we are proposing adding two new investment categories to the Plan; an Emerging Markets category and a World Bond category. More than half the world GDP is now occurring outside the United States and within the plan we only have one international investment option. It is a good one, the American Funds EuroPacific, but that is more specific to developed countries and more of a Large Cap exposure. The Emerging Markets will capture those developing markets. I think that would be a beneficial place. I think it will continue to be an area where you will have GDP growth in those countries outperforming more than the developed countries. These developing countries will eventually be turned into development and I think they will offer good investment opportunities.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is that global or international?

Mr. Hetrick: It is international so there would be no U.S. holdings in that and that would be developing countries.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there a global product?

Mr. Hetrick: No, there is just the international Large Cap, the American Funds EuroPacific. You can put together, like in the models, you would have global exposure. You would have the U.S. along with the international. So, you can kind of design how global you want that to be. I think it is important whenever you are adding a new asset class you have to ask yourself and be able to demonstrate is this providing world diversification. You measure diversification as per the correlation coefficient or how

these investments operate relative to one another. If you had a 1 that means it is a positive correlation where they are moving exactly the same. A negative 1 would mean that they would move exactly opposite. Within the study in Section 3 what you notice is the correlation coefficients by adding like the Emerging Markets is much lower than how the existing Large Cap International relates to the existing investments within the plan. What we have been able to demonstrate in that study before we looked at adding an actual fund is seeing whether we could provide diversification and the study shows that both on the bond side of things with adding a world bond and on the Emerging Markets adding that it provides increased diversification opportunities for the participants. After that we did a manager's search based upon the new IPS (Investment Policy Statement) criteria. We found that the Fidelity Emerging Markets was a good candidate along with the American Funds World Bond R3. So, what we are recommending is that both of those funds be included in the plan line-up. We provided illustrations on how they could be incorporated into the plans' models, the five investment models going from a conservative to an aggressive allocation. We would, if you would approve this, look at a roll-out sometime in May and work with Melissa Wion, the Benefits Coordinator, to set up educational meetings with the participants.

Mr. Hartwick: I will come back to that one question that Commissioner Haste asks for individuals who are in existing asset allocation class and within an existing provider whoever that may be, are you going to give them a time period or are you going to allow them the opportunity to have their own flexibility to get out?

Mr. Hetrick: This would be an addition so we are not taking anything away. We are looking at an enhancement and the ability to provide participants with increased diversification. With the investment models the way that they are set up back in September what we did was we established five new models that are available and are listed online for participants. We had that issue where originally when we had the models set up they were just on paper. Let's say that someone is getting close to retirement and they want to go maybe from the moderate growth to the conservative growth model they had to have that piece of paper in front of them or if they were enrolling online they couldn't do that because they didn't have the paper in front of them. So, we created those models as an investment option. One of the key things that is nice about that is that with those models as we include these new asset classes we can automatically include those into the models. Those people who are in the models would be very few right now because only really new participants or people who I have spoken to about those on an individual basis have invested in those and moved over. As part of the educational initiative, we would have fact sheets on the models on the internet and as a handout and talk about those investment models as well as the new funds.

Mr. Hartwick: We are asked to do two things, the Investment Policy Statement change to reflect the new company's name and some of the changes you made. I don't have a problem with that. The actual new contract is there any changes in the new contract that we should be aware of?

Mr. Hetrick: The fees are less so there is a reduction in fees.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is a good point to make the sale.

Mr. Hetrick: The last thing would be the addition of the two new funds.

Mr. Hartwick: Steve, you have done a great job with employees that I have talked to and our Benefits Office from the people that I have had interaction with in the County. You spend the individual time and the additional time that is necessary just because you changed company names I know you won't change the way you do business and we appreciate all you do for our employees.

E. Steve Libhart, District Attorney's Office

1. 2008-09 STOP Violence Against Women Grant (A VOTE IS REQUESTED**)**

Mr. DiFrancesco: What money have you found for us now?

Mr. Libhart: I'm sorry to say this is not exactly new money. This is a program that we have been participating in for the last eight or nine years.

Mr. DiFrancesco: When you can keep money coming that is a good thing also.

Mr. Libhart: What I have this morning is the 2008-09 Continuation of Dauphin County's participation in the STOP Violence Against Women Grant, which is issued to us through the Commission on Crime and Delinquency. As you will see in just the budget breakdown it shows almost \$52,000 in Federal funds. The \$28,000 are almost the equivalent of that. It is actually budgeted into everybody's budget, because it is the same amount that we contribute every year. It is not a new appropriation. In short we are just going to continue the same plan of advocacy and aggressive pursuit of people who commit crimes of domestic violence against women and continue the PFA and Enforcement Team that we spoke about last week.

Mr. Hartwick: Has the cash match increased in this grant?

Mr. Libhart: It has not. It is actually a decrease, because the funding amount from last year was slashed 40%.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the submission of the 2008-09 STOP Violence Against Women Grant to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency; motion carried.

F. Jack Lotwick, Sheriff

1. Restructuring of Sheriff's Department

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have a proposal before us through the Salary Board packet to make some adjustments and structuring of the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Lotwick: Back in 2005 I started to see a problem in my office. There was no command and control. There was no rank structure. Like most police departments and military organization there should be something. There should be somebody who is responsible.

Mr. DiFrancesco: There should be someone responsible on each and every shift and each and every operation.

Mr. Lotwick: There should be somebody at certain locations who is responsible for the actions going into that office. I had deputies who I wanted to put in certain positions sign a document that I'm sure you have seen that they were not requesting any increase in salary or anything like that. I thought that was pretty much the end of that. When the union contract came up there seems to be a problem. They were given an increase. That increase is about \$44,000 for about 14 different people. I didn't see it coming. I was blindsided. I was surprised like everybody else. That was not my intent. The intent was to keep command and control. When that happened all I can say is I'm sorry for any surprise that we have caused any member of the Board. We still need those people at those positions who can and will do the supervision. When you get to a point where people are going to say I'm the same rank as you, I don't have to really listen to what you are saying and you are trying to get people to move back and forth and do things you certainly need some kind of control.

Mr. Hartwick: Then you step in and say you absolutely need to do what you need to do.

Mr. Lotwick: There are eight courtrooms and people on the street. That is why Dave Kling was so instrumental. After you finish a courtroom he could say now go to another courtroom or go pick up a car some place or go do something like that. When he would do that sometimes people would say I've been here longer than you, what gives you the right to tell me. Of course his answer would be Jack told me I'm in charge. There was that bickering back and forth. That is not good for morale. That is why I decided to go into a rank structure.

Mr. Hartwick: If somebody would say that in your organization you can tell them that there are a lot of people that want to be sheriffs. You can be here and gone tomorrow if you don't want to listen to where you are supposed to be going. You can be quickly replaced.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The bottom line is insubordination is still something. While it has been made more difficult, the giving up of current management rights, it is still in affect and can still be dealt with severely. The question I have, well comment first. I just want to be clear so what you are saying is the reason you didn't first bring this to the Salary Board was simply because you didn't think it was going to have a budgetary impact and

that it was simply going to be a change in the administration of the office. Was that your assumption?

Mr. Lotwick: These people were not promoted.

Mr. DiFrancesco: They were just sort of given this rank structure that was not supposed to be formal was your understanding of why it didn't come before us before?

Mr. Lotwick: Correct.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Having said that now looking at the list, first as the office currently exists with I believe six senior lead deputies, what was your management structure? How were those senior lead deputies used? Were they made senior lead deputies by virtue of the time they were here or were they actually assigned one senior lead to courtroom operations, warrants and so forth? Can you tell me what the current structure was in terms of management?

Mr. Lotwick: Dave Kling was the senior lead that was in charge of assigning people to courtroom duties. If someone was missed on a list and was needed for Court his job would be to make sure that someone would go out and pick that person up out at the Prison and things like that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, he basically was the one giving direction to the courtroom operations. In fact his senior lead deputy status did give him the authority to direct people as a member of management.

Mr. Lotwick: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Can you keep going down that list?

Mr. Lotwick: Dave Miller has been around for close to 30 years. He is in charge of taking people to and from trips. I guarantee you every day we have someone driving to Wilkes-Barre or Pittsburgh and making sure that they get their proper assignments.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So it is specifically everything that he does in terms of scheduling.

Mr. Lotwick: The majority of his time is scheduling trips.

Ron Hopkins is a senior lead. Ron is pretty much in charge of street operations. If there are people on the street and they have a question instead of them picking up the phone and calling Chuck or me they can go to Ron. Ron is very experienced. He has been here for 20 years.

Mr. DiFrancesco: He would actually be overseeing the street operations, warrant service and things like that?

Mr. Lotwick: Civil process mostly.

Jim Titus is another senior lead. Jim handles the warrant team. That is mostly his bailiwick where he would be in charge of the PFAs, criminal warrants and the DRO warrants.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Okay, Ron would be the civil side and Mr. Titus would be the criminal and bureau side. They are basically doing the same job but different areas.

Mr. Lotwick: The civil and the criminal are very different. Over the last couple of years we have been given a lot of extra responsibility. Now we have NCIC that we are in charge of.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How many within each of their oversights, like how many people would they be supervising?

Mr. Lotwick: That would vary day-to-day.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As people shift out of the courtrooms on non-court days they might be on the street or it would change.

Mr. Lotwick: Nan Miller is a senior lead and she is the inside coordinator for the civil process. She would be in charge of making sure that the assignments got out to the deputies that were going on the street. We have it divided into zones. There are five zones and the deputy who would be going out there would get their work after she processed it.

The final one is Don Green. Don is in charge of actually the day-to-day data entry into our computer system of all the incoming warrants. Besides picking up NCIC, Clean, we also got all the magisterial district judges failure to show warrants, which is a tremendous burden. He is in charge of making sure that stuff gets processed.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, Deputies Miller and Green would really more or less be an administrative role, not really supervising people?

Mr. Lotwick: They are giving assignments to people. They are telling people that they need to come in and do this today. The same thing with Nan. Nan is telling those people where to go and want to do. She has direct supervision.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I guess what I'm trying to figure out is the supervisory duties between the two street operation people and like Deputy Miller on the inside, how does the management handoff go, what types of management responsibilities is the inside person responsible for and then what is basically the street officer?

Mr. Lotwick: The street guy is basically the guy who has to answer the question when like what is wrong with this service, is there something that we can do. If something

came down and something was missing or if there was a question on a service they would go to Ron Hopkins and ask him and he would answer the question of what he is doing. Nan, same thing with the inside, she would be telling him where to go and which assignments they have. Then when they get out in the street Ron will take over. Nan does a lot of other things also along with that. If that claim doesn't show up she can go down and sit at that desk and supervise that kind of operation.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm really trying to get a feel for who are people actually taking orders from kind of on a day-to-day basis? Who is leading the team and gives them their daily assignments and that sort of thing? How the operation actually works assuming five guys go out to serve warrants who is actually directing them where to go and what to do on a day-to-day basis? Assigning their workload, I guess.

Mr. Lotwick: That would be Nan.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Deputies Titus and Hopkins are really there for informational purposes, they are not really giving direction on an ongoing basis. They are more or less there...

Mr. Lotwick: Titus' supervision is over what they call the warrant team. Those people that are out serving DROs...

Mr. DiFrancesco: That's right, because you don't have really an inside person for that. He is taking that role on by himself.

Mr. Sheaffer: What we did in essence is the senior lead deputies were appointed to sergeants and one of the senior leads was appointed to lieutenant. In that way, the level of command or control increased in that the one senior lead who was appointed to lieutenant then covered the entire courthouse. All the deputies that were assigned to the courthouse were his responsibility to send to different places. If a courtroom that was running a case and they needed an extra deputy or prisoner they would contact that senior lead to get that person moving through the courthouse when they needed to be. The only other senior lead that wasn't promoted to sergeant was one that was made a corporal. That was the person that was more assigned to administrative work in the warrant office with information and the computer system and that is Donald Green.

Mr. Lotwick: He didn't go up in any category at all for pay raise. He stayed at the senior lead.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, now shifting gears to the current operation. You already answered my first question. The lieutenant does not have oversight of the entire operation. He is specifically really focused on the courthouse operation in that lieutenant's role. He doesn't substitute for you guys if you would be out of the office. I'm trying to think of a military structure. When the chief is gone who steps in?

Mr. Lotwick: If Chuck, Rinehart and I go out he would be the next in command.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Now, moving down to the sergeants' positions, have their roles pretty much stayed the same, as you just described them under the new rank structure or have they picked up – their title changes or their responsibilities or both?

Mr. Lotwick: They haven't gotten any additional responsibilities that I can see. It is pretty much what they...

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is that from a senior deputy to a sergeant position, it is pretty much just the change in name to be more in line with what you mentioned like a military operation? You are just trying to step in line with how other organizations operate?

Mr. Lotwick: Yes and the fact that these guys do – if Kling is out also then of course Titus would be in charge.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As far as the corporal positions, with the exception of the one that you already mentioned, Deputy Green, the other deputy sheriffs who were under the proposed plan getting stripes, now how has that changed, what was their responsibility under the old system and what is their new responsibility and purpose now? As I see now they are really the ones that by virtue of if you put a stripe on someone's arm you have to assume that they now are supposed to be answered to if you don't have a stripe on your arm. Given the fact that they now have authority over other folks, what is their current responsibility as a deputy sheriff and then what is their responsibility as a corporal?

Mr. Lotwick: The majority of them are assigned to a courtroom. Every courtroom, every judge operates differently. What we found out years ago is that it was much better to have somebody who understands how a courtroom works. Some judges like all the defendants brought up and put in that jury box and you may have four or five defendants sitting in that jury. Others want the people brought up one or two at a time. I need somebody in that courtroom to go over to the other deputies and say I need you and someone else to go downstairs and bring up prisoner 23. So, they bring up prisoner 23 and then they say take 23 down. That deputy there is the deputy who is in charge of that courtroom and he works very closely with the judge on what the judge needs and how he or she wants to operate.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How was that done prior to the institution of the corporal rank?

Mr. Lotwick: It was pretty much the same way.

Mr. DiFrancesco: But that person was still more or less sort of the judge's right hand, but they didn't have authority over someone else. You are saying that one person on the assignment regardless of how many folks you have assigned to a particular courtroom their role is to work with the judge and sort of manage the operation. They know what the judge wants, whereas the other two or three that might be working in a courtroom at that particular time are assigned to possibly transporting the prisoners up

and down the steps or keeping them in the back. That person who formally was just simply a deputy sheriff was assigned to be at the judge's ear.

Mr. Lotwick: Absolutely.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, now we are taking that person and making him a corporal.

Mr. Lotwick: Correct.

Mr. Sheaffer: We basically put that person that was appointed to corporal in the courtroom in charge of three or four deputies each day that were either in the courtroom with him or would be placed somewhere else. What that person would do would check each deputy for uniforms, make certain they were properly attired, they would check for vests that they all have their armor on, they would check the firearms to make certain that the firearms are in good working condition and that they were clean. They would look at the prisoner schedule for the day and run backgrounds on the prisoners that were coming in to the courtroom to see if any prisoners are having a situation perhaps at the prison that his deputies in the courtroom should be aware of. Two prisoners sometimes can't get along so if that is the case they want to have them separate when they are coming into the courtroom. We also had that person who was appointed corporal trained and certified with the taser. He or she was the only one in that courtroom that would operate the taser. It was also that person's responsibility to tell those deputies in the courtroom where to stand, when to get the prisoner, who stays with the prisoner, what deputies are at different points in the courtroom so that security in the courtroom is protected. That corporal could also order the deputies to serve orders or warrants that were issued by that judge. So, those are the additional duties that we kind of gave that person.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, now those are duties that were assigned when the new rank structure came into place? Who actually took care of those responsibilities prior to the new structure coming into place?

Mr. Sheaffer: They really weren't taken care of. They were really taken care of in a way that was very inefficient.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is what I need to figure out. Things like the operations of the courtroom, I won't necessarily talk about the cleaning of the guns and the wearing of the vests and stuff, because that is something that obviously may or may not have been happening that we would really not recognize, but in the operation of the courtroom where obviously is telling someone to go down and get certain prisoners before likewise where to stand and so forth, how was it done prior to? I'm assuming those are not new responsibilities.

Mr. Sheaffer: That was one of the issues or problems that we had is when we put someone in that courtroom and they would tell the other deputies to do something, some of them wouldn't do it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is where we are getting back from the original conversation. For purposes of just putting out a scenario, if there are four deputies assigned to a courtroom, one of those deputies I guess was given the assignment of being in this position by the judge. I'm assuming as part of their duty assigned by somebody in management, they were told look make sure the courtroom operates. The moment that somebody else working in that courtroom would say to that person look I've been here longer than you or whatever I'm not listening to you they are being insubordinate and actually they are now challenging maybe a directive of somebody up above. So, what I'm trying to do is to filter out the idea that these things have always been going on and in reality simply because we now put somebody in there with two stripes it is not like they are getting new responsibilities they always had those responsibilities that was part of being a deputy sheriff. Someone had to fill the role of the guy or gal that stands at the judge's shoulder and says this is how I want my courtroom to operate. Now whether or not that duty and responsibility was shifted around or if one person traditionally held that position in reality each of the four deputies in that courtroom had certain assignments, your responsibility is to stand in the back of the courtroom and keep peace and your responsibility is to move prisoners and my responsibility is to stand with the judge and make sure things are operating the way that they are supposed to. I'm really, in terms of our responsibilities under the law and because of our responsibilities in terms of Salary Board and how positions are created we are only trying to understand that new duties were not in fact given to anybody, it was sort of maybe formalized in terms of positions of responsibilities they always had, but really no new responsibilities were given to anybody. In my mind just based on the way operations run and being familiar with the military organization, having been in the army, I understand in my own mind I can sympathize with the management team that went from being senior deputy to now being just called something different basically and the financial impact really wasn't there in terms of the six people that became sergeants or lieutenants. It wasn't a financial impact. It wasn't a lot of damage done to the budget. Where we really get into problems is when now the corporals are brought in and now called management, because that is where all the tremendous financial impact came from and that was the part where realistically under the code that couldn't be done. That was the part, in order for that to be done, that would have had to be approved by the Salary Board. That is what I am trying to figure out how we move forward, because right now we have to decide because these weren't budgeted positions and so forth what is necessary and what is not necessary. As I sit here today I look at it and say I don't need a corporal in every courtroom as long as I have that sergeant giving guidance. If somebody now wants to say I don't have to listen to you, the person standing up there with the judge, they are now being insubordinate to somebody and they will have to answer to somebody. I think Commissioner Hartwick already sort of alluded to and I'll certainly put it out there for the record, I have no time whatsoever for insubordination, especially as you mentioned it. When there are guys carrying guns you want to be insubordinate take a hike, because there are a lot of other people that are well trained to come in and fill that role.

Mr. Lotwick: One other problem we had was the fact that they are all the same rank. The guy who was in charge of making that courtroom work never felt much like he was a supervisor. He felt like he was just one of the guys that was up there doing that and it would be difficult for him to report the insubordination.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The only thing is I would say then he didn't fully understand what his role was in that job that he was standing in, because in reality you don't have to have a stripe on your arm to know what your responsibilities are to carrying out those responsibilities knowing full well that along with the not having the responsibility of a corporal in that courtroom ultimately the responsibility moves up the chain to the first management position, which in this case would probably be a sergeant. He has a responsibility to fill the role. He is just filling the role. It is not like he has authority over everybody else. He is basically speaking in my mind for two people, the judge and the sergeant who basically assigned him to that position and part of his duties are look this is how the courtroom operates and okay it is time for you to go get prisoners.

Mr. Tully: You are crossing into a cautionary area in that we don't know where we are going to be actually going in structure and we do have a union in place unlike the US Army has. So essentially we start talking hypothetically about disciplinary options, grievances, etc. It is an area that is somewhat ill-advised in this particular setting.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Those were my opinions and not that they would carry any weight.

Mr. Tully: He was getting ready to respond to that and that is where I wanted to step in.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We are sort of on shady ground right now, because again the positions haven't been created.

Mr. Tully: That's what worries me. You are talking absent those positions what would you do in that situation.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We are really speculating right now in terms, but I think the Board has to get an understanding of how the operation flows and what it means in order to make a decision about which ones we agree with or which ones we don't given the circumstances that we have a budget in place.

Mr. Tully: I'm actually just cautioning the Sheriff not to say how he would handle that situation.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In this particular matter I would welcome any input that you have at anytime that you have it. I've spoken long enough. As far as Salary Board are there any other questions.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm going to talk about this more. First thing is as a matter of practice and procedure, I don't care who you are, there are no changes to titles for any elected

official or any department directors without authorization of the Salary Board. Is there any issue with that at all?

Mr. Lotwick: I have no issues with it at all. In 2005 I didn't understand that.

Mr. Hartwick: We just need to make that very clear and I just want to make one statement. There is no change in position titles, whether or not there is a monetary tie to it or not without authorization of the Salary Board. In order to keep our records consistent and in order to make sure we are okay on the budget side and to make sure we are okay on the Personnel side we cannot make any changes without the authorization of the Salary Board.

Mr. Lotwick: Understood.

Mr. Hartwick: It just needs to be extremely clear. Any future changes that are going to occur it is very clear to us that if you do make internal changes there will be ramifications in any arbitrator's ruling whether or not you have assigned additional responsibilities or you haven't assigned any additional responsibilities that will come with sort of monetary change based upon recent arbitrator's actions. Just as long as we are clear. No changes without authorization from the Salary Board. Two, in the handbook for a deputy sheriff, some of the duties that you described to me having been the mayor of a police department are things that individuals are required to do in their job regardless if they have supervision or not. If they are not they are derelict of their duties and managing individuals to make sure that those duties are being carried out needs to be a function of that office from the top down. If people aren't cleaning their guns and people are not doing the things that they should be doing, I would like to see what actually a deputy sheriff receives when they are sworn in and they have all their certifications there has to be minimum requirements for the daily operations of their job listed in their job description. Those things need to be carried out and the oversight needs to come from the Sheriff's Department. We don't need an additional supervisor to tell them to clean their gun. We need them to perform the duties that they were hired to do without supervision and they need to be carrying out their duties and responsibilities as you define them. If they are supposed to do something in the courtroom and you tell them that they need to do something in the courtroom they better do the things in the courtroom or whatever grievance procedures are in place need to be adequately followed? I think that should be clear and a message to your staff that if you are asked to do something by the Sheriff of Dauphin County, I know I'm going to listen, I know your staff and your deputy sheriffs should follow suit without question. If they are not doing that it is a management issue and an issue from the top and you need to address that internally. You are an elected official and it is not up to us to tell you how to run your operations. We feel confident that you know how to do that, but those things are management issues. They are not necessarily issues that need to be changed within any kind of corporate structure. My thought is just as long as we have those two things clear I will not support any change unless it is run through the Salary Board, unless you get authorization from the Salary Board and those duties as assigned

should be a part of the management responsibility not any additional defined responsibilities from individuals within your structure.

The other thing that I would like to just visit quick is first of all I would like to go on the record and say that I love you Jack and I think you are a great guy and I don't mean and sometimes I come off attacking and I don't want to do that, but I'm very frustrated sitting here.

Mr. Lotwick: It goes both ways.

Mr. Hartwick: I want that to be clear before I even begin. You had made some and it may not be an appropriate time to bring it up. I don't know what we are going to be asked to act on from the Salary Board. What are we going to actually be asked to act on as a Salary Board? Could we just review that today for a moment so we are clear. The first one is to change a full-time lieutenant into a full-time senior lead deputy sheriff.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The other way, the full-time Senior Lead...

Mr. Hartwick: Create the full-time lieutenant and then eliminate a full-time senior lead deputy sheriff, what are we doing there? Is there going to be monetary impact? What is being requested?

Mr. Lotwick: That is the guy who actually runs the court system most of the time is the lieutenant and I'm requesting that he be made a lieutenant.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there going to be monetary impact to that?

Mr. Lotwick: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: So, he is going to receive an increase in pay.

Mr. Lotwick: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: And do we have those ranges? Let me take a look at that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: He is going up basically from...

Mr. Hartwick: The reason for the change in title is? All of these impacts, I want to ask first, are things that in the most recent budget I received from Mike Yohe are all reflected in the Sheriff's budget? Are these Salary Board items included in the budget summary that you provided to us prior to this?

Mr. Lotwick: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: This will reflect the appropriate revenues and expenditures based upon if we take these actions?

Mr. Lotwick: Yes.

Mr. Tully: Keep in mind that even though there was an arbitration award that simply dictates what has to be paid if the Salary Board creates one or more positions in any of those particular ranks. The package before you is essentially reflecting what the implications by the arbitration award if we maintain or create positions that are commensurate what the sheriff did two years ago thinking there was no implication. You are free to accept none, all or anything in-between. That is totally up to you as Salary Board.

Mr. Hartwick: My initial feelings for the actual corporals, based on what I heard today, are no. That is why I want to go through and if you want to talk about different positions and reclassifying those positions what does that mean? Can you just give a brief description?

Mr. DiFrancesco: One thing to clarify too and I want to be sure that I'm certain on this the numbers that we are looking at, part of that increase was their normal cost of living increase and then another part of it was the step for the position. In looking at this, I was getting ready to say that this is close to a \$2 change when in reality that is broken down. It wasn't completely a \$2 change. There was the element of their normal annual increase and then the job also got them some additional.

Mr. Hartwick: For the lieutenant position, from what they are doing currently to what they are supposed to for the first one, the person who is going to be moved into the full-time lieutenant job and a full-time senior lead deputy sheriff will be eliminated, what is going to be their increased duties as a result of the change?

Mr. Lotwick: Probably nothing.

Mr. Hartwick: So, you are asking for a reclassification and a salary increase?

Mr. Lotwick: Correct.

Mr. Hartwick: For the full-time senior lead deputy sheriff to go to the full-time sergeant, there are four of those, what will be the changes and duties and responsibilities?

Mr. Lotwick: They will be the same responsibilities that we had that I talked about earlier with the supervision of moving and answering questions on the street, supervising the input of the warrants and supervising the fast team and the supervision of the civil process.

Mr. Hartwick: The only other question I have is the licensing division, the change there, is there going to be any change in duties and responsibilities?

Mr. Lotwick: No, he has responsibility for the input and for two people.

Mr. Hartwick: That takes care of my questions for the Salary Board requests. The last part is for the new positions from last year and I think this is probably an appropriate time to revisit this issue since you are in front of us. Last year we made the commitment that we will try to find additional revenues to fund the salaries of the seven new positions that were created in the budget and so far, based upon the most recent look of the budget that I have gotten, it appears that we are under revenues by about \$197,000 projected for the entire year. It looks like with the payment in the arbitration award that is going to occur, it appears that on the expenditure side we are about \$47,772 under the projected revenue side. If you take a look at that as a whole that puts you at about \$150,000 short of the revenues projected to be able to fund the new positions.

Mr. Sheaffer: We did a very complete projection to the end of the year for all the categories of revenue. What I did, I took the four main areas of revenue generation that we have somewhat of a control over and if you look at the first line where it says deputy sheriffs cost reimbursement that is the reimbursement that is generated from training costs that is returned to us for every time one of the deputies attends training. Submitted last month was \$38,813 which is pending and should be arriving shortly. The next one is sheriff prisoner fee bill. That is the fee that is collected from the warrants that we serve, the cost of transporting prisoners and so forth. You can see I projected \$186,000 and I think Mr. Yohe projected \$182,000. In the past three weeks we made 42 arrests by warrants, because we were able to put two teams out on the street, which would be four deputies working the warrants. So, if that would continue this revenue would likely increase as well. The third line is the sheriff fees civil process, that is an important category and if you look at January this is the part of the revenue stream that is very sick-like, there is not much coming in the first quarter and then it will start picking up in the second and third quarters.

Mr. Hartwick: I see right here the warrant one which you have at \$186,000, which is about \$4,000 above what is projected in your budget. The second one is for the civil process, which one is that under here?

Mr. Sheaffer: It is the sheriff fees.

Mr. Hartwick: \$812,000 is what the estimate was from us, which I see right there and you are projecting at \$715,000?

Mr. Sheaffer: Yes and we are hoping that it will go above that. This is all based on civil suits, but because we don't have all our people trained and out on the street some of this is probably going to be generated by the sheriff training cost reimbursement to kind of compensate for that.

Mr. Hartwick: The cost reimbursement that was budgeted was \$52,400 and you have \$38,000 pending so even to reach that actual estimate you are going to have to have a

significant reimbursement beyond that to offset any of the deficiencies in revenue that is projected for any of those items.

Mr. Sheaffer: Right. You are also going to look at the child support. We have a propensity to collect additional monies in that also, if we can keep the two teams out working.

Mr. Hartwick: So, you are projecting that you are going to be able to do \$89,000 and we have budgeted \$64,000, which would be close to a \$25,000 increase. So \$25,000 here and \$22,000 and with the prisoner fees is going to be about \$40,000 and then you are doing the \$812,000 and a reduction of close to \$100,000 in the actual civil process, so minus \$100,000. So it is sort of wash in revenue even based upon what you are showing me here, because there is going to be a \$100,000 reduction in the civil fees process and an increase of \$25,000, \$50,000 and \$25,000, which is about \$100,000 in all the other areas of revenue so which will come to a wash. Based upon the projections that still leaves you short the \$197,000. Am I correct in that?

Budgeted is \$52,400, \$130,000, \$812,000 and \$64,400 were the budgeted revenues. They are going to be \$100,000 down in the civil fees process, if everything gets served and then it is going to increase by \$100,000 in another place. So, what you are saying is that you will meet every budget projection that has been listed in here although you are currently \$197,676 behind.

Mr. Sheaffer: Yes, barring any catastrophe in the Sheriff's Office I think we can come very close to the projected revenue.

Mr. Hartwick: Revenues were down last year and we were tracking this in the quarterly and then the half year process and then there was always something that came up and the revenues based upon what you projected last year were down. So, you said you were going to increase revenue in order to offset these current positions. Everything needs to hold true in order to do that or else the public record should reflect that we are not going to fund those positions in the future. That is the deal that we made.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Yes, that was clearly what was said during the budget hearings.

Mr. Hartwick: So, it is not going to be the Commissioners go ahead and attack public safety and eliminate seven jobs from the Sheriff's Office, it is the revenue projections were not met and therefore we cannot maintain those positions based upon the commitment during the budget cycle. I just want to make sure that is a clear statement.

Mr. Lotwick: I understand your statement, but what happens is that we didn't bring these people on until the end of January. So, it is a matter now of getting people trained and getting it on the ground to get the teams out. That is where Chuck is saying that it is going to pick up.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In fact during the budget cycle when we approved the positions we knew that the first evaluation really wouldn't be done officially until like maybe six months in till those people got on the ground and started working. The challenge is as the Commissioner mentioned is that by years-end these guys need to understand that they are basically self-funding their positions right now and at the end of the year if they don't come through on the revenues, if they are not hitting the streets and really serving these warrants and raising that extra revenue then we will reverse basically the decision that was made last year to add the troops, because it was always under the premise that these warrants had to be served, revenues would be generated and the manpower would be offset.

Mr. Hartwick: Mike, I see where my math went wrong. I'm trying to figure out why \$197,000 deficient, because what I'm seeing here is a wash. Where are we falling short now? (Mr. Yohe showed Mr. Hartwick the figures.)

Mr. DiFrancesco: It is the lag of getting the people on the street.

Mr. Hartwick: No, it is actually the difference between \$812,000 versus what it appears to be projected at year-end of \$553,000 for the sheriff fees. He now has bumped that up to \$715,000, which that is a significant goal for you to reach and two months to do an evaluation is really close.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Are the guys on the street now?

Mr. Sheaffer: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: They are trained and on the street now?

Mr. Sheaffer: Yes.

Mr. Lotwick: The people that we hired are not the people that are actually on the street. They are being trained in the courtrooms, etc.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Right. How many people now on average are out on the street compared to what would have been last year?

Mr. Sheaffer: Five.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, there are five people on the street this year. Last year that would have been what?

Mr. Sheaffer: Two.

Mr. DiFrancesco: On a good day?

Mr. Sheaffer: Yes, some days none.

Mr. Lotwick: Don't forget we used to lose a lot of time during criminal court week and now they changed the way they are doing business in the courthouse. Instead of one-day miscellaneous court there are three days of miscellaneous court. That is an influx of 60 prisoners a day.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, you have five people on the street on average. How has the warrant service actually improved in terms of numbers? What are we doing in terms of warrant service on average compared to last year?

Mr. Sheaffer: The first quarter of this year we made 110 arrests. In the first quarter of last year we were probably half that. There is a significant increase in the warrants.

Mr. Lotwick: Plus we do an awful lot of DROs. We did 78 in the first quarter. The people who are involved in all that, the people who are making, like Green, who is doing the input, the people who are actually serving, 67% of their salary is covered by the State government.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How would that compare to the same time last year?

Mr. Lotwick: I don't know what we did last year, but it wasn't close. We really picked up on that. We are waiting for the State to pay us. They are not good at paying right away.

Mr. Hartwick: Mike, what is this row officers' investment Rev?

Mr. Yohe: That is the invest earnings that they get on their individual accounts. They deposit all the money into their accounts and then they write out checks to the State and County. They earn interest on those funds.

Mr. Hartwick: Because the market interest is down, that is projected to be a loss in revenue for the upcoming year.

Mr. Yohe: I'm sure.

Mr. Hartwick: The child support stuff and the sheriff fees are the areas where we need to monitor related to revenue and if they are not coming in closer to projections then you should make sure to alert us and find out how we are prepared to take action. We do it at six months and then nine months to make a final determination for the upcoming year's budget.

Mr. Lotwick: That is fair.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Are there any other questions?

Ms. Rebeck: I guess I'm kind of new into this. I know there was talk also of the possibility that if these are not created, these positions, because I was basically under the assumption that we were going to be kind of forced to do this.

Mr. Hartwick: No.

Mr. Tully: We are not going to talk about any potential implications at this point in this forum. I'll talk to you before next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Can you explain what the arbitrator's decision made?

Mr. Tully: If you create a position that is what we have to pay. The issue will be that people were doing the job for a period of time and that is where I don't want...

Mr. DiFrancesco: The arbitrator's decision basically told us how much if the positions were created we would have to pay. It did not say that we had to create the positions.

Mr. Hartwick: That is starting January 1, 2008.

Ms. Rebeck: If anybody is going to vote against this I certainly would like to have the opportunity to understand what...

Mr. Tully: I would like to advise you of that in some other setting.

Ms. Rebeck: That's correct. I don't want to be forced if there is going to be opposition to this. I don't want to have to be forced at this point to vote one way or the other without having some questions answered.

Mr. Tully: Absolutely.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This will be next week. It is pretty clear to understand.

Mr. Tully: I'll bring you up to speed.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Lenge: Do you have any questions on the Salary Board items? (There was none.)

In the transaction listing I just want to point out Change #18 at the time we did this we didn't have the rate information. The proposed salary rate is \$9.17, Range 1005, Step 03, Grade 04.

Mr. Hartwick: How is that a promotion?

Ms. Lenge: I would call that a transfer. Going full-time doesn't necessarily make it a promotion.

Mr. Hartwick: It is actually a reduced hourly salary.

Ms. Lengle: He is getting benefits now. Are there any questions on any of the other items?

Mr. Hartwick: I guess what we do next week will also determine how we vote on #27 through #41.

Ms. Lengle: That is correct.

Mr. Saylor: I would point out the hiring window opens in mid May. I see there is one, #15 seems to be coming out of the window and I will look into that a little bit more. There are a couple others that are close. Generally Prison and EMA are ones that we fill as needed.

Ms. Lengle: #15 is a temporary employee who has been working in our department. There is money coming out already for her.

Mr. Hartwick: I don't see any reason why the Personnel position can't wait until mid May.

Ms. Lengle: I guess we should compare the cost of what we are paying a temporary agency versus the cost of salary and benefits. We can do that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Item #23 I need you to sit down and talk to me about. Also, just an FYI, there is a clerks position coming from JPO where they just found out a clerk was leaving and it is a critical position. I just wanted to let you know that I support that moving forward right away.

Are there any other questions on the Personnel Packet? (There was none.)

DIRECTOR OF PURCHASING

Mr. Baratucci: It is a very small packet and believe it or not there are no over budgets. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Was the issue resolved with SSI?

Mr. Saylor: No, not yet.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is it actively being worked on?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: There cannot be time delays. We need to get that resolved.

Mr. Baratucci: If that gets resolved do you want to have that added to the Packet so it can be approved next week?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I want to get that done as quickly as we possibly can, because this project has been managed well and on time and I don't want something like this to get us behind.

Mr. Hartwick: Doesn't the actual Director have a little bit of work to do?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Yes, but the Director needs to hear from the Board's perspective.

Mr. Hartwick: I think he has already.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I want to make sure things are in motion.

Mr. Saylor: Scott and I had a meeting with him on Monday. We looked over the contract.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I need one of two things. I either need this on the agenda for next week for a vote or I need to know why that can't happen. We need to push it along and get it moving. This is a work order that is, again, not complicated. There is an issue there to be negotiated, but it is not something that is complicated. We know what the body of work is and we need to move forward to get this approved, because again there are too many things happening right now. We are at a critical time in the project and it cannot be sidetracked at all.

Mr. Baratucci: When you get this resolved can you also let me know if the \$50,000 that we approved last week is staying there. Is there going to be an addition to that? We did do a purchase order for \$50,000 that was added to the old contract, so that when we get this resolved we need to do something with that. I don't know how you are going to resolve it, but have that out there as part of your resolution.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The Solicitor promised us that the appropriate response would be documented and placed into the record.

Mr. Tully: When they do their part, I will do my part.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Saylor: There is nothing that needs approved.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. Appointment of Paul Navarro (term expires 1/1/2013) and Karen McSherry (term expires 1/1/2010) to the Dauphin County Industrial Development Authority. **(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 4/9/08***)**

- B. Appointment of Stephen Libhart to the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority – term expires 1st Monday of 2013.
- C. Request for exoneration of real property taxes on Property #32-026-005-041-0041, Lot 41, Cedar Manor Mobile Home Park in the amount of \$1,374.49. (The Tax Assessment Office has reviewed this request and has recommended denial.)
- D. Request for Refund – Property #30-016-004 – Michael R & Tracey L. Henry - \$36.42.

Mr. DiFrancesco: It looks like we have Item A on the Agenda, two appointments to the Dauphin County Industrial Development Authority that needs a vote today. My question is should we not do the second one as well. Is there any reason not to do the second one as well?

Mr. Saylor: No, there is not.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve Items A and B listed above under Items for Discussion; motion carried.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT – WILLIAM TULLY, ESQ.

Mr. Tully: Just one clarification, Steve Hetrick said that his contract has been reviewed and approved. It was turned over to us yesterday and it will be reviewed and hopefully approved by next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think there may be some questions that I may have on that and there is some information that I need to know. Whoever is going to be assigned that to review I just need to know so I can reach out to them.

CHIEF CLERK'S REPORT – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: The only thing I would point out in talking about boards is that we are working on the Affordable Housing Board. There are a number of terms that have expired and what we would like to do is stagger their terms. Their terms right now are at the same time. I believe there is at least one vacancy that we need to fill.

Mr. Hartwick: Richie and I have had that ongoing discussion.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think I have identified an individual for the last position on the Industrial Development Authority. He is submitting an application. I don't know that we received it yet, but that last appointment should be filled I'm guessing hopefully no later than the next two weeks, if it is not ready for next week.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. DiFrancesco: I just want to raise one issue very quickly and it is one of those potentially politically incorrect comments, but I simply want to bring it up. I'm always inspired this time of year as we start to get our invitations to attend the Boy Scout breakfasts that we go to and when I get into a room like that and hear presentations from those that support scouting and from individuals who are either Eagle Scouts or in line to become Eagle Scouts. When I see an organization that turns out, in this case, specifically young men with the standards of excellence that the Scouts produce it amazes me. I commend that organization quite a bit for the virtues that they continue to promote in terms of ingenuity and the ability to think and lead and to survive. It is still very much an organization that has a standing in our community, an important value in our community. If we really take a hard look, the politically incorrect part of that is if we take a look at where our society is with our kids. I picked up the paper today and read a headline that kids are actually fighting in this establishment and that parents are probably just as bad as the children. The bottom line is society is in a really tough place right now. I have heard a couple stories over the last few days where parents sometimes are ten times worse than the kids. It is unfortunate in today's day and age that we don't do enough politically incorrect communication to tell people that there are still standards in society, that it is still important that you maintain some sense of decorum when you are in public, that your selfish world view carries no weight and it is unfortunate time and time again I see where parents fall down. Not only are they telling their kids, not teaching their kids these virtues, they are also basically expressing that the world is yours go and take it. It is very troubling to me when I pick up an article like this and I read it. The bottom line is we have this great asset, a family place where people can go and there are those who can't seem to get along. We talked about it in the very beginning of this where we were praising the many people who work here and their efforts to protect kids and so forth. So much of what we do has to do with those who just can't seem to function well and play well with others. So much of every resident's tax bill goes to those who don't function well and can't play well with others. In this case this morning, I'm not talking about those that have challenges that they face. I'm not talking about those that necessarily have the mental health issues or the addiction issues. I'm simply talking about those people out there in the community that can't play nice with others that they are engraining in their kids and teaching their kids that they don't have to play nice with others, and they don't have to excel in school and they don't have to listen and so forth. In keeping with my Chairman's position on our inaugural day that we are no longer going to be politically correct, I'm certainly going to take every chance that I get to assist. It is important that the police departments in this area or wherever it might be start to teach parents that they have a responsibility to be parents. That they basically send their child down a line of whatever you want to call it, limitation or failure in their life when they don't teach them how to relate well with others. It is unfortunate and I don't want and this blanket-staining should certainly not fall on anybody who doesn't deserve it, but I hope it does fall on the spirit of some that do deserve it. We have a whole lot of punks in our community and that issue needs to be resolved. It is a really sad day when kids at a facility that is designed to entertain and play can't get along well. A parent shouldn't have to be concerned about taking their

child to a particular place. I don't care if it is the presence of language that is inappropriate, which seems so common today, or if it is actually aggression between kids or between their parents. I heard of an example of one yesterday that I can't even share publicly, because I think criminal charges are pending. It has nothing to do with today's article, but where a parent certainly not only didn't intervene, but escalated the situation. It is time we start to truly go after and attack these people through the legal system. Sometimes it just builds up and you see things that set you off. But if you want to do something to curtail tax spending and so forth, let's reduce the size of our prisons and in order to do that we need families to be families again, we need parents to be parents and we need punk attitudes to be eliminated from our community. That was my politically incorrect statement for the day.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk

Transcribed by: Richie-Ann Martz