



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

AUGUST 22, 2007
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Marie E. Rebuck, Controller; Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget and Finance; Steve Libhart, District Attorney's Office; Hector Ortiz, Human Services Director's Office; Tory Pinto, (Intern) Commissioners' Office; Diane McNaughton, Commissioners' Office; William Struemke, Solicitor's Office; George Connor, Community & Economic Development; Kay Lengle, Personnel; Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Leila McAdoo, Solicitor's Office; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Gertrude Farling, Controller's Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Commissioners' Office.

GUESTS PRESENT

Steve Little, Mary Taylor, Rev. Ron Tilley and Jerry Gleason.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haste: We have meeting minutes that we will take up at next week's meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Rev. Ronald Tilley

1. Update on the "Dauphin RSAT Grant"

Rev. Tilley: My name is Rev. Ron Tilley. I'm the Executive Director of the Firm Foundation of Pennsylvania. I'm here to give you an update and to answer any questions you may have about the Dauphin County Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, which is a grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

The grant started July 1, 2007. This is a grant that was awarded to the Dauphin County Commissioners. The lead agency is the Office of Adult Probation. I wanted to give you an update in regards to this grant. On July 3rd, the Firm Foundation was fully informed of its responsibilities in regards to this grant. We were charged with carrying out the implementation of this program. This grant focuses on residential substance abuse treatment, which would be inpatient, outpatient and aftercare. We really wrote up this grant, on behalf of Dauphin County. We put in a narrative that there wasn't enough just to address substance abuse. This was just one part of the re-entry process. You need to address housing, mental health and the community. You need to engage the community and have them involved in the re-entry process. What we did was we approached, before the County submitted this proposal, the Capital Region Ex-Offenders Support Coalition. On Page 2 there is an outline of who is involved in that Coalition and their vision and mission statement. This grant was written in such a way that even though the grant is only for, initially it was submitted for 12 months-that's all the funding that was there, we submitted it to fund the Re-entry Coordinator position for the Coalition that the Coalition would hire and supervise and then take ownership of its continued existence in the community. So that when we talk about sustainability this will not be a program that comes to the County for one year, spends some money, tries to have an impact and then has to close its doors, because the PCCD funding ran out. We really work hand-in-hand with this Ex-Offenders Support Coalition to develop this re-entry program. We were informed July 3rd of our responsibilities so immediately we

appointed an interim Re-entry Coordinator, whose office was at the uptown Career Link. We established an email address for them and emailed the appropriate people, the State Board of Probation and Parole, County Adult Probation and other re-entry stakeholders on what the process would be to refer people into this grant. These are people who are returning to Dauphin County, either from the State or the County system. It could be a person doing State time in the County Prison, someone that is coming out of a State correctional institution or it could be someone doing County time at the County Prison. We informed the stakeholders what the procedure was. Immediately we got referrals in July of 2007. We placed three people in inpatient treatment, placed three people in outpatient treatment and provided transition housing for two persons that were in need of that. We provided career development services for two persons and we also started providing parenting services for two of those persons. We successfully negotiated inpatient and outpatient treatment rates with providers at the same rate as the Dauphin County Single County Authority rate. So, we got the County discount that had already been negotiated. We are adding to the list of providers. That is just what we accomplished in July. We needed to negotiate those first before we could place individuals. The Coalition successfully identified and has presented an offer for employment for someone to start September 4, 2007 full-time in this re-entry coordinator position. They would be based out of the CEED Office on 13th & Derry Streets. What we are doing, we contacted the Single County Authority, Dauphin County Department of Drugs, Alcohol and Tobacco and they said that they would rather that we administer the grant rather than running the treatment through them in terms of the billing for the placements. I believe that is the way the Dauphin County RIP Grant is handled; which is another PCCD Grant. It is not going through them. It is being billed directly to the District Attorney's Office. They thought because they are in transition that this would be the best way for us to get off the ground and get people into treatment and would not have to wait because this is only a 12 month program.

Mr. Haste: Come January that changes or shortly thereafter.

Rev. Tilley: Yes, and if the County wants a different arrangement, at anytime it can be changed.

Mr. Haste: I'm not saying, I'm just letting you know.

Rev. Tilley: Yes, I heard that.

One thing that I am requesting and this may answer any of your questions is I did want to make one other observation. This re-entry coordinator position for this grant, these 12 months focus basically on getting people into inpatient and outpatient treatment and what services they need. We see this as being a permanent fixture in our community. Some of them do case management for people who are re-entering from Dauphin County and from the State system back into Dauphin County, from DCP and from the State correctional system and also from the Federal system into the County. The Capital Regional Ex-Offenders Support Coalition is willing to take ownership to look for

sustainability for this position and we would hope that the Commissioners would also assist us in making this a sustainable position. I included a three page report on community collaboration in terms of citizen re-entry services, family group conferencing, you bring in the assets of this community and say how can this person re-enter into this society, what is going to make for a successful reintegration and then that group follows them through and recognizes their successful reintegration into the community and then we are able to use it as an indication of their good faith in the community to be a successful participant. We hope that this will add to such things as greater civic engagement, more successful employment, etc. for the person who is re-entering. What happened was when this grant was submitted to PCCD on the next page after the white paper on re-entry you will see a project modification request. When the grant was originally submitted, the personnel sub-grant budget for personnel was \$46,834 which would be true only if it was a Dauphin County employee doing this job. That is what that reflects in the current budget with PCCD. The same would occur with employee benefits. That would only be in the current category if it was an employee of Dauphin County doing this position. It is not, it is a position through the Coalition, through Goodwill and cooperation with the Firm Foundation. The same with the supplies and other operating expenses, all the categories that you see there include other categories those would have to be direct expenses by Dauphin County the way that the current budget is set up. However, we were informed and it was also written in the grant in the narrative portion that Firm Foundation was going to take the lead as the fiscal agent, doing the work of getting a re-entry coordinator on board, doing the work of coordinating the drug and alcohol treatment, spending money for supplies, equipment, etc. and invoice the County. That would require a budget modification. So, what I have here is a paper format of what we are going to submit. I went over this with PCCD with their financial consultant and they helped me to fill this out to get the numbers in the right category. At the very end of your packet, Appendix O, which is the pass-through contract agreement you will see these. This just means that this will not be an employee of Dauphin County. This is not going to be something where the drug and alcohol treatment gets billed directly to Dauphin County. Everything is getting billed to us and then we are submitting the invoices.

Mr. Haste: Do you need us to approve this?

Rev. Tilley: Yes, there is no pressing timetable on this. You do not have to act on this at this meeting. You can take it under advisement and have the proper people look at this. We feel that we have the time to make these corrections. It is not something that needs to be done at this meeting. It can be done at a later time.

Mr. Haste: Bill, can you get this ready for next week?

Mr. Tully: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Of the six patients that you have so far, where did they come from? DCP? Adult Probation? State?

Rev. Tilley: We had three of them that were released from Dauphin County Prison, one was a walk-in who referred himself who also had spent time in Dauphin County Prison. There were three that were referred from the DCP system, one was referred by himself and two came through the State Probation and Parole Board.

Mr. Haste: Are you aware of Senator Specter's legislation on re-entry?

Rev. Tilley: I'm not fully familiar with all the details, but yes I have received some alerts about it and I would like to learn more.

Mr. Haste: I have left his office know that we would be interested in being a pilot if in fact that moves forward. I serve on both the national and state County Commissioners committees and it has been an active program for the past three years. As we move forward we may need to take a look at, not that I like to slice the pie up too much, we may want to prioritize this to Dauphin County, meaning those that come out of our Adult Probation and Prison more so than the State, because there are different funding streams and the State could and should have funds to deal with their own. As it goes, unfortunately the way government sets up in Pennsylvania, there will be different funding streams. If we end up doing the State's we may end up short changing those in the County that may need it when there is another option for those in the State and there is not another option for those in the County.

Rev. Tilley: Yes, I believe that this fund initiated with the PA Department of Corrections as it went to PCCD so that is why they are included in this particular grant. But, we can focus on those in the Dauphin County Prison.

Mr. Haste: They are not going to have any other choice. Folks coming out of the State are going to have a choice through this legislation through the State. So, if they use up our dollars that is dollars that someone is not going to be able to access in the County.

Rev. Tilley: There is currently a loophole in terms of funding of people that do State time in the County Prison. Currently the Department of Corrections does not pay for their treatment upon release if they are doing State time in a County Prison. We found that a good amount of these funds is being used for persons in that instance where the State will not pay for their treatment.

Mr. Haste: Dauphin County doesn't have a whole lot. You will hear that from other counties, but when we have gone back and looked at our numbers we are probably in the single digits.

Rev. Tilley: It probably is and we are just getting those single digits referred to us.

Mr. Haste: We are probably in the single digits of people who are doing State time in the County system.

Rev. Tilley: We would be willing to focus this upon those that are being released from DCP doing county sentences.

Mr. Haste: How are you getting the information from the Prison? How are you learning of potential clients?

Rev. Tilley: Through Mr. Davis' Department and the officers there.

Mr. Haste: They don't do much with the jail.

Rev. Tilley: They are referring to us people who have recently been released and saying that they need drug and alcohol treatment. I would like to set up a meeting with someone from the Prison.

Mr. Haste: Because of the lack of effort from the Dauphin County Drug and Alcohol Department, we hired a person, again through the assistance of a grant, out there. You should sit down with her because she is going to be the one. She is identifying all the substance abuse problems we have now and is working with the DA's Office to get them into rehab, etc., which should have been done. She is probably your best contact there. I would think that in some cases those folks are going to need more help than Terry's Work Release folks. In Work Release they are somewhat integrated back into the community now as part of that. These folks, my fear with people coming out of jail is if they don't have any assistance they are going right back to the same apartment to the same neighborhood, the same circle that they left when they got there and it is just a matter of time until they are coming back.

Rev. Tilley: These are persons coming from DCP, because they would be under Mr. Davis' charge. They are not from Work Release.

Mr. Haste: So, they are people who are released from the jail that are on probation.

Rev. Tilley: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Again, he is probably not our best source.

Rev. Tilley: I'll check with Erica to make sure that she is fully aware so we can work together.

Mr. Haste: The goal is as we move forward she will become our key person in getting people out of the system and into better systems, whether it is re-entry, rehab or whatever the case may be. She is going to be our key person.

Mr. Hartwick: Who is the re-entry coordinator going to be? You indicated that she was selected. You made an offer. They may or may not accept.

Rev. Tilley: Yes, I'll get to you the information as soon as I get the resume, etc. I know the person that they made the offer to has a lot of experience with the Department of Corrections.

Mr. Hartwick: Commissioner Haste talked about trying to focus on just the County Prison re-entry folks. If you are going to develop a plan for sustainability you are obviously going to want to take a look at what funding streams exist and budget for what your costs are going to be. It is only a year away that you are going to have to start to figure out a way to sustain yourself, thinking ahead of ways to do that and maybe gaining through our budget process, looking at what the commitment from the County is and how do you plan to see this thing pan out down the road. The sooner you can probably do that the better. Just at least in a proposal form from my standpoint. Again, assuming that you are going to just concentrate on the County, that may limit your sources of funding versus opening up your sources of funding for the re-entry program.

Rev. Tilley: I think what it is going to take frankly speaking is it may take a funding source that does cover the County, but it is going to take a funding source that will cover the State as well, because there is a need for case management. We can certainly put together a proposal that may split the pie if you will – how much of the time is going to be spent on the County, the State and there is a small percentage of people released from the Federal system back into our County as well. Their successful integration has a bearing on other costs to the County in terms of a lot of indirect social costs – whether child support is being paid, whether their family has to go on TANF or other support services from the County, law enforcement, etc. Certainly the people returning from State will have an impact on that.

Mr. Haste: I'm not suggesting that we don't look at those. I'm just saying that when we move forward to keep in mind they may have other funding sources that County people are not going to have.

Mr. Hartwick: If you think about it I don't want to lose money that should be going towards County re-entry for the State and Federal, because they are infamous at passing costs onto us or taking advantage of our creative ways to address the problem in ways that they don't have to address it from a budgetary perspective. If you look at it from an overall viewpoint, you would probably want to have a one stop shop for re-entry for all levels. What I would encourage you to do and I'm sure you probably are already doing is through the channels and Jeff's connections that he has on the Federal and State level start to look at every available way to seek funding sources not just for drug and alcohol stuff that you are focusing on, but job training, housing. All of those issues should be a part of the re-entry program that exists for all ex-offenders who are re-entering back into the community. That would be my preference.

Mr. Haste: I would suggest if you haven't yet, look at funding across the board. We get no State funding or support and it is all County except for grants that we can get here or there. The regular operation is funded by the County. To follow their methodology and what they are doing is probably a pretty good starting point. It is just that the funding is

completely different here than it is there, the way the funds flow. Montgomery, Maryland and a county in Oregon have been recognized as the top two re-entry facilities in the nation.

Mr. Hartwick: During the transition of the changeover you should make sure that you are in constant communication with Erica, Betsy Nichols and whoever is going to be the new director of the new County run drug and alcohol program. There is a big amount of work ahead of you, but the possibilities are great.

Mr. Haste: I love the idea of it being the non-County community oriented based function. That will make it more successful.

Mr. Hartwick: I agree.

Steve Libhart, District Attorney's Office

1. Community Revitalization Assistance Program

Mr. Libhart: I have today for presentation and I would like to request a vote on whether the Office of the District Attorney, on behalf of Dauphin County, can accept a grant in the amount of \$121,400 from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Community and Economic Development. We were approved a few months ago by both the Department of Community and Economic Development along with Senator Piccola's Office about reinstating some dedicated patrols around the City's housing projects. The reason we were approved for that is for the last five to six years we have not, or the City of Harrisburg Bureau of Police, has not been able through budget cuts and manpower shortages to maintain what was once a very successful program of making sure there was a dedicated officer or officers to patrol all of the housing projects in Harrisburg. For that reason we have seen an increase in criminal activity within those areas. In fact, it is not uncommon you almost see like a free open air market with some drug and gun things, both of which as you are all well aware are real hot button issues right now as far as criminal justice is concerned. Because of that we were approached to receive this grant as a means to give some funding to the Bureau of Police in order to reinstitute these programs. Not so much as a way to rack up some criminal statistics although probably undoubtedly that is going to happen. This will be as effective as a deterrent as anything else. It was well established that the officers that formally used to do this had developed a sense of partnership with not only the managers of those communities, but also the residents within. Because of that there was a lot more cooperation in investigating any alleged criminal activity. There was also a much higher success rate in combating it and putting an end to it. For that reason, we were approached to reinstitute it and that is why I'm here today.

Mr. Haste: Is there a match required?

Mr. Libhart: There is no match. There is also no guarantee that it will be continued, but usually those two things go hand-in-hand.

Mr. Haste: Any questions?

Mr. Hartwick: They have already been answered.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there any accountability back to the District Attorney's Office in terms of how the program...

Mr. Libhart: There is. We are going to designate one individual prosecutor to kind of be the liaison between the District Attorney's Office and the officers that are assigned to this patrol. He or she will probably handle every case that comes out of this initiative. As a result, either they or I will be the person that is invoiced for the hours and the cost, because we are going to do it as a pass-through.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Do you foresee sort of a team system being set up where it is somewhat regular contact with somebody in the District Attorney's Office and these officers that are doing this job?

Mr. Libhart: Absolutely.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the Community Revitalization Assistance Program Grant in the amount of \$121,400 from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development for the District Attorney's Office; motion carried.

Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance

1. Results of the Investment Bank RFP for the period September 2007 – February 2008

Mr. Yohe: I'm here today to go over the results of the RFP that we just completed for our investment accounts. The term of this RFP will be for September 2007 through February 2008. I sent it out to nine or ten different banks. You can see that M & T Bank and Mid Penn Bank, Centric Bank and PA State Bank they did not submit bids. I know in the case of M & T one of the qualifiers I put in was if the State Invest Account was higher than their monthly bid that we would move the funds into that and that actually ruled M & T out. He told me that they could not compete with the Invest Account. In fact, the Invest Account is very good compared to the results of a lot of the responses that I got. They are pretty straight forward. One through five is very straight forward. The wildcard in this, as I mentioned last week, was Citizens Bank. The more I looked at it and spoke with them they want us to lock up the money for six months in a term CD, which was just not what we had talked about doing. Essentially the longest term, the bulk of the money over \$25 million that they proposed was the lowest rate. They wanted us to lock the most up for six months and that was only at a 5.2% rate, which was less than what I was getting elsewhere. Then they submitted an alternate proposal which was worse. Ultimately they ended up at the bottom. I'll talk to them a little bit more about maybe if we want to lock some money up. Everybody is indicating

that the rates are going to start going down so we may want to lock some up at current rates, maybe for this six month period and they will certainly be in that mix. I analyzed the rate that they quoted going back to January 2004, which is around the time I started getting information on the rates for these different banks. I averaged the rate out for the last year and in all cases they were the same. Community Banks over that 43 month time frame, from January 2004 through August 2007, had the highest average rate of 3.811%. For the past year they were again the highest at 5.285%. Their proposal is 90 day Treasury Bill rate plus 29 basis points. Again they are the only ones that are adding points to their index that they are feeding off of. If we go with 1 and 2, Sovereign Bank will probably be #1, at least initially, because LIBOR rates rose dramatically in the last week or so. So, going into September, they would probably be #1. Most of the money would go to them. PNC, as you recall, they wanted out of it the last month. I had a call into her yesterday advising that I'm going to present this and do you want in or out this time. I have not heard from them. I suspect they are probably going to want out again.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Why don't they bid?

Mr. Yohe: I don't know. I'll let you know. Again they are under the Invest rate anyway so their share would go to Invest in this plan. I'll let you know when I hear from them if they are able to compete with Invest, if they actually want the 25% share or not. My sense is that they will not. We may end up just going with Community and Sovereign again. Graystone didn't change. They sent me a nice little memo saying that they essentially are in the same boat they were six months ago, same position. They want to keep in the mix, but at this point in time they can't compete for these kinds of dollars. Commerce really dropped down. They are going to be one that we are probably just going to cut the ties with at least until they are back to being more competitive. My suggestion would be Community Banks for sure, Sovereign and I will find out from PNC what their goal is here and then probably in September I would guess we are going to have Community Bank, Sovereign and Invest as being the shares that we would go with.

Mr. Haste: If that's the way it falls, then that is the way I would do it.

Mr. Yohe: Sovereign probably #1. Since my report last week LIBOR went up like 20 points.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I know you commented on this earlier, I just want to be clear as far as the Citizens Bank CDs, did you say there was also a component that required us to give them a certain portion of the money?

Mr. Yohe: The way they structured, I gave them an estimated balance of \$35 million for September, \$34 million for October and it dropped. What they did, they were going to take the full \$35 million and in September you can take \$2 million of it out. That is what you are telling me you need as the average balance. The next month you can take \$3 million out. They took a base amount that they would have for the full six month term and then they wanted it locked up that I could withdraw money at the end of each

month. I said that we don't work that way. I might need money to cover payroll or debt service in-between. They said that you can do that. I said can I withdraw on the lower rates. We are locking up the biggest amount at the lowest rate for six months. I said if we were to withdraw \$2 million lets take that out of the 25 that's locked up for six months. No, you have to take it out of the current rates, which were getting the higher rates. They were estimated first couple months at 5.4%. If they are going to give us 5.4% for a couple months I may lock maybe \$10 million or so up with them or at least check around to see what the rest of the banks can do.

Mr. Haste: The thing that I don't like about locking the bulk of it up is that takes your ability to shop money month-by-month away.

Mr. Yohe: It does.

Mr. Haste: You have been very good at that. That has been what has made our program successful.

Mr. Yohe: The qualifier here is I think we have hit the peak. We have been enjoying a rising interest rate probably for the last three years.

Mr. Haste: It will go down for a while and then years from now we will be back.

Mr. Yohe: If we want to do that I'll talk with Citizens a little bit more. I don't want to just say okay we will give it to you without throwing that out to the other banks as well.

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Yohe: My recommendation again would be Community Banks and Sovereign. If PNC doesn't want it we can just say that we will go with two for this six month term.

Mr. Haste: We can use Invest.

Mr. Hartwick: I would make a motion to accept the top recommendations.

Mr. Yohe: I will comment at next Wednesday's meeting for an official vote then.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Lengle: Are there any questions on the Salary Board items? (There was none.)

Mr. Hartwick: I'm glad to see that you are cleaning them up.

Ms. Lengle: Yes. Are there any questions on the Personnel transactions? (There was none.)

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: You all should have received your Packet yesterday. There is only one item that I will note on Page 3. I think the strategy that we have used with our Security x-ray machines in that we have elected not to take service agreements because of the large cost has actually worked out pretty well for Mike. About once a year he needs to do this type of repair. We have six machines and we would be paying a lot more with the service agreements. This is one time where not taking service agreements, so far anyway, has worked out well. Mike does a good job keeping track of this. He will have to move some money, which he said he has. This has worked out pretty well. That is kind of unusual because most of the time the service agreements seem to be the way to go. That is on the report this week, as well as a budget adjustment for IT. Do you have any questions on the items?

Mr. Hartwick: Page 16, I was informed that is just a matter of the regular changes that are made to upgrade all computers. Those in fact instead of just giving desktops, it was IT's suggestion that we actually order the notebooks.

Mr. Baratucci: Those are probably for reimbursement otherwise they would be on the leasing program. That is my understanding. The report will be ready for your approval next week.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: I don't believe there is anything on the Training Packet that needs approval.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. Exoneration of current and outstanding taxes on the following mobile home parcels:
 - 1. Parcel #29-007-077-054-0054, 70 Dawn Av. 54, David & Doris Morgan in the amount of \$120.32.
 - 2. Parcel #24-020-043-020-0020, 1200 E. Caracas Av. 20, Christine Reisinger and Parcel #24-020-043-034-0034, 1200 E. Caracas Av. 34, Scott Saksek in the total amount of \$1,845.16.
- B. Appointment of Shelley Mastrella and Ronald Enders to the South Central Workforce Investment Board.
- C. Contract between the PA Department of Community & Economic Development and the County for a Community Revitalization Assistance Program. **(**A VOTE IS REQUESTED 8/22/07**)**

Mr. Haste: Item C was approved earlier under Mr. Libhart's discussion.

SOLICITOR’S REPORT – WILLIAM TULLY, ESQ.

Mr. Tully: We have a relatively thin report, but I’m happy to answer any questions you might have. (There was none.)

CHIEF CLERK’S REPORT – SCOTT BURFORD

Mr. Burford: I have nothing new to report, but I would like to point out in the spirit of old business that we have not received any communication from City Council regarding the Incinerator.

Mr. Haste: I spoke to our Special Counsel last night and they have made that request and they still do not have that document. We have a draft of what they think, but there is nothing indicating that it is official.

Mr. Hartwick: It shouldn’t be that hard to get a resolution.

COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

Mr. Haste: Anything else for discussion? (There was none.)

We have a Retirement Board Meeting which we will convene after a very short break.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk

Transcribed by: Richie-Ann Martz