



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

SEPTEMBER 22, 2010
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Haste, Chairman
Mike Pries, Vice Chairman
George P. Hartwick, III, Secretary

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Janis Creason, Treasurer; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Kay Lengle, Personnel; Amy Richards, Commissioners' Office; J. Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; Melissa Wion, Personnel; Mike Madden, Prison; Joe Cardinale, Solicitor's Office; Carl Dickson, Director of Parks & Recreation; August Memmi, Director of Community & Economic Development; Fred Lighty, Esq., Human Services Director's Office; Leila Brown, Solicitor's Office; Peter Vriens, Director of Human Services; Faye Fisher, Director of Personnel; Steve Farina, Prothonotary; Guy P. Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Stacey Patrick, Controller's Office; Brenda Hoffer, Commissioners' Office; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Mark Stewart, Esq., Matt Miller, Alice Trowbridge, Bonita Mahoney, WHP, WHTM, WGAL and Fox

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:16 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

I was remiss in my comments. I remembered in my moment of reflection. It is important to note that normally Marie Rebeck is with us. Today, unfortunately she is at her brother's funeral service. As we move forward we should keep her and her family in our thoughts and prayers.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haste: We have a number of meeting minutes that we'll 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

A. Carl Dickson, Director of Parks & Recreation

1. Presentation of Fort Halifax Park Master Site Plan

Mr. Dickson: We're here to talk to you briefly about Fort Halifax Park and to give you an idea of the possible plans for the future. We all know that parks help build communities, but it takes a community to build a park. We have been undergoing a year long process for the future development by involving the citizens to create a master plan for that park. We are still in that process. Today, we would like to show you two proposed plans for your comments.

I want to give you just some brief history. You may remember that this property was known as the Yeager Farm. The family wanted to preserve it as open space. The Central Pennsylvania Conservancy and Halifax Township Supervisors and many others worked to raise funds to purchase this property. It can only be used for passive recreation. To responsibly develop the property and to be eligible for future funding, a master site plan must be developed. A study committee was appointed to shepherd this process from citizens in the community. They hired Larson Design Group. (Carl introduced Alice Trowbridge and Bonnie Mahoney.) We have been meeting for over a year and had a series of community meetings as well. After much spirited and

thoughtful discussion, we have narrowed down many people's vision for the property into the following two plans. I want to remind you that these plans are not cast in stone. They are being presented to you and many others for additional input. They will provide a future guide to develop the park with cost estimates, opportunities for income and priorities for development. It is a master plan. It is not going to happen all at once. I'm going to turn it over to Alice.

Ms. Trowbridge: I want to thank you for the opportunity also for your support of this project through the years and also for Carl's support as part of our study committee. We really value that and appreciate it.

As he mentioned, we have two plans. The first one and I will give you a very quick overview of the plans. At the end if you would like us to elaborate more we would be happy to do so. These are just in sketch form. They have not been presented to the public yet. (Alice had a PowerPoint showing the design.) There is a zone along the river of being a conservation area for river conservation. There will be trails and picnic areas, interpretive signage, canoe/kayak launch and maybe some camping from off the river. There is an active Norfolk Southern rail line. There is a heritage interpretive area. In that zone and the northern portion is where we believe Fort Halifax had originally been cited so there is an area for an archeological dig and possible reconstruction of the fort. There are areas for Native American interpretation. There is a building envelope here, which is excluded from the conservation easement, which would allow them to build an education center or other buildings in the future. As we move across the railroad, we also have the Wiconisco Canal and between the Wiconisco Canal, the Railroad and Legislative Route 1, which is Route 147, we also feel there is opportunity here for maybe interpretation of the heritage of how transportation played a role in early American settlement and development. From the railroad, we have some wet meadows. In the dry season we can use them for overflow parking, keeping them green, and mowing them basically with some areas of developed parking. In the northern area we are talking about perhaps a remembrance walk. It could be a wooded area with a walkway, interpretive signs, maybe talking about the many conflicts that our country has been through over the years. Maybe we could work with the veterans as a partner in that area. We would like to restore the allée. It is only intact on one side and maybe plant some wildflower plantings along that as well. In this plan we are going to keep the meadow area open, doing some grouping of trees for shade, trails throughout, perimeter areas, we would have the parking come in. There is a natural amphitheater area here that we could use for outdoor education and programming. There would be more parking in this area with some pavilions. There are beautiful overlooks up on that hill. The corridor where the creek is located there is a lot of opportunity there for learning about ecology and things like that. There would be trails and some primitive camping by permit. Again, very passive recreation park, not a lot of intensive development. We did look at a dog park.

Sketch B, a lot of it is very similar. Instead of a memorial park, we would put a dog park. We have done a more formal arrangement for a festival area having centrally located versus on the perimeter for parking and activity areas.

Again, there are two different things. We are looking for feedback from the public. We will be presenting these on October 25, 2010 at the Halifax High School and will hopefully get a lot of feedback so we have one plan to move forward in a responsible way for the development of this park. At this point, we would be happy to give you more information if you are interested. We value your input, either now or later. I left business cards so if you would like to contact us later that would be fine as well.

Mr. Haste: I would just like to say thank you. The interesting word that Carl used was spirited. It has been over the last few years. I would really be interested to see what the public comment is, because as far as I'm concerned, I have been supportive of this all along, but it really is the people's park and they need to be the ones that determine what the future looks like. It will be interesting to hear what they say after you have your meeting at the High School. When is that again?

Ms. Trowbridge: October 25th. It is a Monday.

Mr. Pries: What time does that start?

Ms. Trowbridge: There is an open house at 6:30 with plans on display so people can ask questions and then at 7:00 would be the more formal presentation and breaking into break-out groups.

We were blessed with a very active Study Group and they have done a great job at leading this through the community. We are happy to work with them. Again, we appreciate your support in the past and in the future.

Mr. Dickson: Are there any questions for us?

Mr. Hartwick: I think the planning for passive recreation is a great use of the property. It allows for opportunities to explore our natural history along the banks of the Susquehanna River, along with opening up the park to be utilized in its natural state without a significant amount of development, is the best plan for the site.

B. Mark Stewart, Esq.

1. Update on Schaffner Youth Detention Center

Mr. Stewart: Thank you for having me before you today. We are here to update you on the continued study of the working group in regards to the Schaffner Youth Center. As I'm sure you recall, we were before you in July and gave you a report on the problems and challenges that you are frankly well aware of that the County is facing at the Schaffner Youth Center. In brief summary, as we discussed on that date, essentially the Federal and State policy and funding changes that have been going on in the juvenile justice system are forcing change. They are forcing change, both by trying to promote better outcomes for the youth, but also in a more negative way by decreasing

and eliminating funding for the County and foisting the burden of these operations onto the County and County taxpayers. To that end, we discussed how the annual costs for Schaffner have risen from \$249,000 a year to over \$2.4 million between the periods of 2000 to 2009. The County had a working group put together from all different areas that have some involvement or touch Schaffner in some way. We have been studying the issues for the past five months and evaluating the various options that are before the County. After that study and at this time, the group is proposing that the facility be closed. We are suggesting and will discuss with you today two options or two ways in which that objective can be achieved.

The first is essentially an immediate closing and I will elaborate on that as we go forward. Essentially a date certain is picked in the very near term. The transition is made and the facility is closed. The second is more of a phased closing in which there would be kind of a cessation of new intakes, but doing some limited duration the facility would phase out as the youth were released from the facility. Closing the facility will ultimately advance policy goals that DPW has championed in terms of trying to regionalize our secure detention services in the Commonwealth. Not having essentially a detention center in each of Pennsylvania's 67 counties. As we discussed last time, many of the counties do not. Those that do are moving in a direction towards the regionalization. It will also enable the County to continue your efforts of trying to support the establishment of in-community service providers, particularly for the shelter service, which does not entail the secure detention. The in-community service that helps to maintain the family and community connections that helps to produce better outcomes for the youth. The proposed recommendation or proposed option is consistent with the approach that other counties have taken. An example would be Beaver County. In July of 2009 they closed their youth detention center. They transitioned the shelter and detention services to two different facilities. The Department of Public Welfare supported that move. The facilities where the youth were transitioned to were at similar distances to what we'll be talking about in this presentation. Beaver County, as a result of that change, experienced substantial savings and according to county officials did not experience any issues, complaints or negative ramifications in terms of the services of the youth.

Under this proposed option, the County would save approximately \$1.2 million annually over what it is currently expending. The cost comparisons for detention and shelter care at Schaffner Youth Center, Lancaster's Youth Center and at the Cornell Abraxas South Mountain Youth Center. The County is experiencing dramatically increased costs over these other two alternative providers. The County's share, as discussed, is about \$2.4 million per year for these services. If the services were provided at Lancaster, the cost would be \$1.2 million to the County, thus generating approximately \$1.2 million annual savings. South Mountain, it would indicate that the savings would be even higher if the youth were serviced at South Mountain's Youth Center. We will discuss later, there is a scheduled per diem increase in Cornell Abraxas's services and therefore the savings would be essentially parallel to the savings that would be realized at Lancaster.

Mr. Yohe helped us put together a savings comparison of the two closing options that I referenced. Option 1 is to close the entire facility on a date certain such as October 15. The youth would be transitioned to Lancaster. That was done, because we knew the per diem there. We will be discussing the fact that there may be multiple providers that could provide the service, but in order to have an apples-to-apples comparison we picked one of them. The savings for the period from October to the end of the year would be approximately \$300,000 with an immediate close. With a more phased out closing through attrition, the savings would be approximately \$225,000. That is just from October to December of this year. The point of that is to say that at least based on a cost comparison basis the savings will essentially be fairly similar regarding which closing option you use, either the immediate closing option or the phase out closing option, should you in fact decide to adopt this proposed closing option.

In terms of the alternative providers that we are suggesting that the County would utilize as mentioned, it would be the Lancaster County Youth Intervention Center and Cornell's Youth Center located in South Mountain, Pennsylvania. Those facilities would provide both secure detention and shelter services under this recommendation. County staff, including myself, has visited and toured both facilities. We have evaluated their staff, the quality of their services, the quality and structure of their programs and we feel very confident and comfortable that they would be providing excellent service to the youth of Dauphin County who have the reason to go there. Frankly that is consistent with the County's existing experience. As you likely know, the County has existing agreements with both facilities for when there is an overflow out at Schaffner. We have found that the County has had nothing but good experiences with these service providers. Obviously the County can expand in the future should it have any issues and look to other providers as well.

Just a little bit of background about each of them. In terms of the Lancaster Youth Intervention Center, they have ample capacity for our youth. They have 72 detention beds, 24 shelter beds. They have adequate beds for a gender breakdown, either way, male/female. It is a 109,000 square foot facility. It opened in 2002. It is in excellent condition. They have the space there that enables them to do a lot of different things with programming and with services for the youth. We have found them to be experienced with and willing to take all types of cases so even the most difficult challenging cases, the most violent cases in terms of youth, they are open to and willing to and have the experience in handling those types of young people. Their programs focused on structured discipline and respect. I think everybody involved found them to be very positive in that regard. As mentioned, the size of the facility enables them to have and offer certain types of counseling that you can only have if you have additional space that can be cordoned off. There was also a chapel there. They have faith-based programs that come in. There were some really neat activities and services that can only help the youth that have reason to go there. In terms of Lancaster, there is kind of shortsighted or stereotyped people may assume that it is not going to reflect a diverse make-up of Dauphin County. In fact, it does. The information reveals that Lancaster's supervisors and staff are diverse. 49% of the female staff is minority. 45% of the male

staff is minority and 60% of the supervisors are representative of a minority or under-represented class.

In terms of the Abraxas Youth Center at South Mountain, it is a smaller facility, but it is a very good facility. They have 18 detention beds and 18 shelter beds. They, as well, obviously serve male and female youth. When we toured their facility and interviewed their staff, there were six Dauphin County youth there for shelter services. Their per diem is increasing compared to the \$219 rate that was listed earlier to a scheduled \$284.17. It is essentially within the same ballpark as Lancaster. I will note, as we talk about transportation, that per diem encompasses more services, including transportation services than Lancaster's. It is really pretty much of an apples-to-apples situation. Much like Lancaster, Cornell Abraxas is experienced with and willing to take all types of cases, most difficult cases. They frequently do that now for other counties. They do full screening upon admission of the youth. They are very advanced in terms of the assessments that they make to try and make sure that they can provide the maximum efficient services to the young people. They focus on the youth as clients. It came through in everything that they said to Scott and me when we were there. They provide a counselor for each. They are very focused on encouraging family involvement with the young people. To that end, they provide for family transportation – transportation for family members to see the young people who are there. They are also interestingly a licensed private school. They have Middle State's accreditation, which if you are familiar with that, it is not an easy thing to get. They are very technology driven in their learning. They had an impressive computer center. All their classrooms had smart boards, which enabled them to do all sorts of things with their educational programming and curriculum in terms of audio visual and various other types of instruction. We saw evidence that many of the students who are there for the first time end up on the honor roll. They offer full high school diploma, GED and even SAT preparation for the youth who are there. The education focus that they provide, the working group thinks will be a good benefit for Dauphin County youth. The Abraxas Youth Center has certain accreditations on the correctional side, as well, which is not always common in these types of facilities; the National Commission on Correctional Health Care and then the Middle States. Their 2010 DPW audit resulted in zero citations. We are very comfortable with the alternate providers that the County can look to for its detention and shelter services.

In terms of additional changes that will be associated with this recommendation, transportation is one of them. There is obviously the need to transport youth from Dauphin County where they are arrested or otherwise detained to the alternate facility and then there is the need to transport those youth from the facility to the Court, medical appointments and things like that. What we are in the process of doing is exploring transitioning that service, which is currently provided by the Sheriff's Office to a private provider. The service will be 24/7 service so that any time of day or night that a youth is picked up and needs to be transported that service will immediately be available. The transition would be seamless for the Dauphin County law enforcement community so we'll not be looking to the various police departments in the municipalities to have to drive to Lancaster or South Mountain. They will not be impacted in any way by the

change. We are prepared and the County staff has prepared a bid process and package to try and identify the provider. We have included in the criteria for that bid package that the provider be certificated as a carrier by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. As indicated that provides certain additional benefits to the public and to the County. PUC, when it certifies carriers, they review them for financial fitness and their technical abilities. They inspect their vehicles and check out their drivers. They make sure that they are meeting inspections, that they have appropriate insurance in place. They also have a complaint process, so in addition to the public being able to contact the County about problems, there is another regulatory body that the public would have access to should a problem arise in any transportation issues. We have discussed in terms of the fact that there is some distance here and the clear goal of the County to maintain familiar connections with the youth. We have discussed that the County could arrange under the expected transportation costs for some regular family visits, probably once every two weeks, which is what is envisioned in the Department of Public Welfare's regulations to assist family members who are not capable of getting down to the longer distance. As noted, the Cornell Abraxas per diem already includes this service so we really would only be talking about that aspect in regard to Lancaster. Ultimately from the projections that have been done, the increases in transportation costs would be minimal and certainly would be absorbed by the million dollar plus annual savings.

In terms of implementing these options and how we would go about it. The immediate closing, essentially you start by notifying the Department of Public Welfare. You obviously work closely with the families. We had proposed an October 15th date for the closing of Schaffner in its entirety. That would include both ceasing new in-takes and we would have to make arrangements to transition or transfer the current residents at Schaffner to the alternative facilities. Then ultimately the employees would cease their employment at that time as well.

In terms of phased closing, it is very similar in terms of reaching out to the regulatory body. The difference would be in that the October 15th date would serve as an end date only for the new in-takes. The current residents or youth at the facility would essentially be reduced through attrition. It is expected to not be more than two months in duration. If it would extend beyond that we could obviously consider transferring those youth to the other facilities. Staff reductions would essentially parallel the reductions in the population.

On both options it would be envisioned that there would be outreach to the community stakeholders, law enforcement, school districts and the like and of course we would have to finalize and implement the transportation changes prior to implementing the new service.

With that we are happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. Haste: On the law enforcement side, under this if a juvenile was picked up at 11:30 at night for whatever reason, law enforcement will take them where?

Mr. Burford: The law enforcement officer would take them back to their barracks/police department. They would then notify our Juvenile Probation Department and then jointly with the decision resting on the JPO officer they would determine whether or not that youth needed to be detained. If that decision was to detain then at that point the JPO officer would contact the transportation company to pick them up at the police station. Therefore, the police officer would not have to transport them down to Lancaster or South Mountain.

Mr. Haste: We are not putting the burden on the municipality to contact the transportation company?

Mr. Burford: That's correct. In my discussions with the chiefs of police that seemed to be a very attractive proposition for them.

Mr. Haste: I, having heard your presentation, tend to prefer the date certain. I think it lets everybody know when the transition occurs instead of leaving things in limbo. I think that is good for everybody involved. Unfortunately for the employees that need to move on it gives them a date certain so they know what they are doing and they are not in limbo. It lets the families know and the Courts know. I'm a little more comfortable with that. Also, it is the less costly of the two, which is a good thing. In trying to wrestle with this whole idea, two things struck out to me. In many ways the services that will be provided here are better for the youth than what we are able to do right now. I'll give kudos somewhat to the Lancaster County Commissioners. I think we know one of the commissioners in particular has made his career in juvenile justice and has made it a passion of his. I think that speaks to the quality of the facility that they have there. The other thing is that this saves our taxpayers \$1.2 million.

Mr. Stewart: It was very clear, as you noted about Lancaster County Commissioner Martin. He led us on the tour of the facility, answered literally every single question that we had, spoke about the facility as if he was a parent speaking about a child. He was very passionate and invested in the facility and in the good work that was being done there.

Mr. Hartwick: I want to talk about how we got to this point. There is a huge misconception that somehow this is a bad thing for the community. When I first started in Dauphin County, we were in a position of having a 48-bed facility where it wasn't unusual for us to have 30 or 40 kids in out-of-county detention. So that means that we were having 78 to 80 kids in detention. Today, out at Schaffner Youth Detention Center there are 15 kids in secure detention. That has only happened through a cooperative relationship with this Board, Juvenile Probation, as well as the Courts, in helping to build up a series of alternatives within our community. Instead of a kid sitting at Schaffner Youth Detention Center in an orange jumpsuit, not receiving programming or family engagement, awaiting a disposition that oftentimes resulted in a 9-month placement to George Junior Republic or Glen Mills at additional expense to taxpayers, a large additional expense, only to be returned to the same problem household, same street

corner resulted in multi-millions of dollars in wasted money only to see a kid come in and out of a revolving door. Quite frankly the system is broken. To be able to change fundamentally the way we are trying to engage juveniles in the process is probably one of my personal biggest undertakings since I have been a County Commissioner. We have engaged faith-based partners. We've engaged the community. We have provided opportunities for small businesses, who employ people here in Harrisburg, from Susquehanna, Middletown, Halifax, Steelton, folks who have been through similar situations who are now being role models for kids and trying to engage families where they're at and doing it with a far better success rate; quite frankly doing it for \$284 dollars a day not \$620.90. We talk about the revolving cycle of kids coming in and out of detention, going to formal placements, only to have a future that's probably leading them down the path of being a farm team for the adult system to changing it to a series of alternatives, both in the household, allowing kids to continue in school. I want to be clear that these aren't kids who are committing gun crimes. These aren't kids who are committing murder or kids who are a threat to our community. Those individuals are going to be the ones that go to this formal detention center. They are not going to be on the streets. For kids who are in need of parental support, in need of additional services and need to continue their education, they are clearly being served in a completely different way in Dauphin County. They are being served in a way that has cost taxpayers a whole lot less and have improved dramatically the success rates of these kids. Is crime going down? Unfortunately, no. Is the amount of kids in detention going down? Absolutely, with the neighborhood alternatives, with both ankle monitoring and some of our day treatment and other alternatives that keep the kids here in Harrisburg, we are far more able to connect and engage them in families than we ever were. Quite frankly the restrictive institution out at Schaffner I think limited the ability for families, community-based programming and school districts to be engaged directly with our kids who need the support and help. I want to be clear. The other things in this case are the cost. We are talking about \$620.90 a day at Schaffner Youth Detention Center for detention. We went from paying almost nothing, about 10% of that bill, when the actual funding stream changed from TANF being eliminated and Title IV-E being reduced to paying well over \$2 million. Yes, as county commissioners, when it comes out of our general fund we have an obligation to taxpayers to pay attention. Not only are we paying attention and changing, but we've also changed the way we do business that costs taxpayers less. Most importantly, through all of this, we engage families and see better results for the kids in our system. We need to make an effort and we need to engage families. We need to build a support system at home otherwise we are only setting them up for future failure. We have what is called neighborhood reporting centers, one at Bethel AME Church, again a faith-based partner, being run by a locally owned African-American business, which has now been running the neighborhood reporting center. We are getting ready to open a potential neighborhood reporting center 2, which is really eliminating the need for secure detention, which is going to be in Susquehanna Township. But \$620.90, \$275.00 to \$282.00 a day, you have to ask yourself a question about the thoughts, clearly they are way out-of-line with other detention facilities. The idea of reducing \$2 million in expenses when we heard yesterday about the Department of Public Welfare failing a Federal audit of Title IV-E dollars, which is going to reduce another \$80 million out of the Children and Youth

Needs Based Budget throughout the entire Commonwealth, not to mention the additional cuts that we received from FMAP, not to mention the other budget cuts that we received. We have an obligation to be more innovative in the way we are providing services and not have it fall back directly on County taxpayers.

The one thing in your presentation that I am absolutely opposed to and quite frankly, it will not allow me to support this moving forward unless we deal with the actual daily transportation for parents. Whether or not somebody has committed a serious crime or whether or not they are in it for other reasons, our whole strategy here in Dauphin County has been to engage the families immediately, figure out a way for them to get engaged with their kids. I want to see in your transportation plan the opportunity for parents daily and again I'll be realistic at Schaffner I haven't seen a whole lot of parents. We want to make sure that we continue to encourage parents and families to be engaged. It is the only thing that is going to enable them to have a successful future. I would like to see an opportunity for parents to be able to visit that facility on a daily basis if they so choose. Even if it is one trip down and one trip back during the course of the day to be able to arrange it at a specific time. I want to have access from families to kids at that facility, whichever it be South Mountain or Lancaster, to visit if they so choose. Ultimately, that is going to determine the success at whatever placement that they go to and when they come home the families are going to be engaged and involved.

The other thing that I was going to talk about is what Commissioner Haste hit on. We've heard all this talk about law enforcement and having to travel to Lancaster or Adams County, it is going to be more efficient for law enforcement. The ability for them to now have that transportation provided and cooperation; which I know they already have a cooperative relationship with JPO. This will allow police officers to stay on the street rather than transporting, even to Schaffner. They have the ability to do that in their own police station. I think it is going to make it more efficient and it will be a benefit to local law enforcement. If the transportation for families is not included, I would not support it.

Mr. Stewart: We had started with that as a baseline. We will definitely revisit the bid specifications and incorporate increased levels of transportation on the family side. As mentioned, the Cornell Abraxas Center does include that service in their per diem. They stress to us that they encourage the family visit as frequently as possible. I don't know that their service structure necessarily involves a visit every day, but it certainly involves it and encourages it more than once every two weeks. I think it is already incorporated into that aspect. That is something that we can build into our contract with them, because we'll probably, as I said, there is an existing contract with them, but it will probably have to be tweaked a little bit or amended to incorporate this. We can address that in that aspect of it. With Lancaster, we will frankly build it into the bid specs. The cost is not that great to do more regular visits. We can discuss with them how frequently whether a daily visit is acceptable to them under their structure and format. If we find out that it is not, we will obviously report that to you and report to you what

interval they permit. We can provide transportation to the highest degree possible. It is not necessarily a cost issue.

Mr. Hartwick: It is important that we do it based upon the regulations. Offer daily transportation for the parents. After six months take a look at the utilization and then figure out a way to incorporate it into the contract. My opinion, in order for me to agree it has to be available for parents. In order for me to support this there will have to be more transportation provided than just every two weeks.

Mr. Stewart: In coming up with our cost projections on the transportation side, we did base it on the actual visitation logs at Schaffner.

Mr. Haste: I want to see the cost side before we get to the point we are doing it every day, because some of these kids wouldn't be there if they had that kind of a visitation to begin with, and for us to ask the taxpayers to pick up the tab for someone, because they didn't do their job to begin with, is a little at times too much to ask for. I think there needs to be a balance between there. I think we need to make it available. Actually I don't know if they have done this, but I wouldn't even mind that after a certain level that there be a cost sharing involved in here, because you didn't do your job as a parent for 16 years and you want me to pay for your trip somewhere as a taxpayer I'm not sure is fair either. Again, it could get used more so upfront, but I think we will see that weaned, because unfortunately part of the reason some of these kids are there is because they didn't have the supervision to begin with. I don't want to have the taxpayers have to pick up more of a burden than they need when these people should have been doing their job to begin with. That is a very broad statement and it is not the case in everybody's situation, but there is a lot to that.

Mr. Stewart: The net kind of differential between the existing costs and the projected costs of this, we were talking less than \$100,000. Certainly less than \$150,000 and that is for the hundreds of trips to take the kids back and forth and get them down there. Even if you had a trip twice a week or whatever it ended up being, you would still be talking about only another 100 trips that you would be adding into that. It should not materially impact the cost, but we will get that information.

Mr. Hartwick: I respect not putting in on taxpayers. The only way these kids are going to have a chance, sometimes it takes five or six times until you realize that ultimately you want to be a law-abiding taxpayer. It may take the experience like this for parents and families to say that I need to be re-engaged. I don't want that opportunity not to exist. Ultimately we want them to be engaged.

Mr. Haste: I agree, but I don't think cost sharing is out of the question with that either.

Mr. Pries: I have a few questions. As you know, we have a fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers of Dauphin County and I've heard the \$1.2 million in savings mentioned several times here. What's at the center of the differential in the cost comparisons between the three locations?

Mr. Stewart: Essentially it is operating costs. As is with any entity, whether it is a school district, whether it is this county, you will find that the vast majority of your budget, at least over 50%, is made up of salaries and benefits. It is the employment related operating costs that drive.

Mr. Haste: Economies of scale.

Mr. Stewart: It is many things, but that is one of the large factors that are driving the costs. There are other aspects to it as well, but when you are looking at a per diem of \$620.90 per day versus \$275 and for the \$275 you appear to be getting more services for the youth it is obviously a little bit out of whack. There are certain specific drivers.

Mr. Pries: Of the \$1.2 million that would be saved annually by the County, you had mentioned that we would have to put the transportation services out to bid, specifically for Lancaster?

Mr. Stewart: It would be for both, but the per diem that Cornell provides covers some of the transportation needs, family transportation, as well as, transportation from the facility to court, doctor appointments and that sort of thing. It does not cover the transportation to get from the police department down to South Mountain. That would still be provided by the private provider.

Mr. Pries: Again, out of the \$1.2 million in potential savings, what would the parameters potentially be, in your opinion, on what that might cost us moving forward?

Mr. Stewart: I think you would be looking at around and this is a rough estimate of \$100,000. It could be less than that. It will fluctuate depending on the youth and the usage and the types of usage. As more of the neighborhood center and in-community providers come up and there is less shelter usage. For instance, if you were looking solely at secure detention, I think you would be looking at about \$75,000 in costs.

Mr. Pries: We all know what happens when bid packages come in; you never really know exactly where they are going to be. It is not an exact science.

Mr. Burford: The bid package that we are prepared to release would tier the pricing. For instance, one tier would include picking up the juvenile, say at the police station, transporting them to the facility, either Lancaster or South Mountain. The other tier would be those routine trips, for instance once the juvenile would be in Lancaster transporting them back for their court date and then back to Lancaster as a routine scheduled appointment. That would be a second tier. The third tier would be the human factor, the transporting of the families. I would expect each of those tiers to come in at a slightly different figure.

Mr. Pries: Do we have recidivism rates comparing the three facilities? Or is that information that is not available?

Mr. Stewart: We looked at some of the information that was available. It is not exactly tracked very well. We looked at the juvenile crime commission website, which does keep various statistics. The other two facilities were certainly Schaffner's equal in all the different categories we looked at and in various different categories it was performing at a slightly better rate on those types of issues. It is difficult and the professionals in the business will tell you that it is difficult to evaluate the recidivism impact in its truest sense, because a lot of the kids are there, for instance on the detention side, they are there for an average of 13 days to 17 days depending on which facility. Even though it is a revolving door as Commissioner Hartwick noted, when they are there for that shorter period of time, because detention is really just kind of a secure holding spot until they are either not placed somewhere, sent back to their parents or they are placed in one of the other facilities, the actual more penal facilities if you will. It is tough to track recidivism, at least that is what we were told by the various operators in this space, because of the short period of time that you are there, the way it is so transient and it is hard to gauge the impact of some of the different services that are provided in terms of retarding recidivism.

Mr. Hartwick: The kids that are being detained are kids that should be detained. The way it used to be done is not the way it is done now. There are alternatives and less restrictive, less expensive options that provides a better option for the kids. They are going to be moved to a community-based facility. We have the capacity to do that now. The kids who are detained who have committed a crime and are considered a flight risk are not placed in community-based facilities. Recidivism rates have declined.

Mr. Stewart: The plan is for you to consider either at your next meeting or perhaps I'll let Chad speak to that.

Mr. Saylor: The plan for moving forward is we are going to release the RFP for the transportation services so that we can get some information back and address your questions on that, but at next Wednesday's meeting we are going to come to you with a plan for closure. October 15th looks like that will be the date and then we will have a final decision for you on what type of closing.

Mr. Haste: I prefer the date certain.

Mr. Hartwick: I prefer date certain. October 15th might be a little ambitious. Even a phase out should be date certain, because you are going to have kids in detention, quite frankly, that a district attorney is trying to build a case on and they are going to be in detention until they are brought to trial. I think date certain with a transition period and the transition period should not exceed the actual date. I was thinking more of November 1, but you could get kids out by October 15.

Mr. Pries: I'm also in favor of date certain.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Lengle: Do you have any questions on the Salary Board items? (There was none.)
Are there any questions on the items in the Personnel Packet? (There was none.)

I just wanted to mention that there is a proposed change in the flexible spending vendor from Assurity to PrimePay and that is Item 11 in the Solicitor's Report.

Mr. Haste: I believe each one of us has been briefed on that. I think it is our intent to vote that next week.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: A Purchase Order Packet was presented to all of you. I understand that there are some questions about it and I will have Mr. Guenther get back to you about those. If there are any other questions, I would be happy to answer them. Otherwise, the budget issues will be taken care of and it will be moved to next week for your approval.

Mr. Hartwick: I understand Mr. Guenther is going to be going away and so am I. I'm not going to be here next week.

Mr. Baratucci: Actually I'll be having lunch with him today and I will ask him to please get back to you today if at all possible. Are there any other questions? (There was none.)

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: I don't believe there is anything on there that we need to address.

Mr. Burford: There is nothing.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Haste: We have the East Hanover gaming as a result of the MOU. Is there anything that needs to be brought up? We don't need to vote on this until next week.

- A. Approve the award of a local share gaming grant in the amount of \$96,281.41 to East Hanover Township, consistent with the First Amended and Restated Memorandum of Understanding with East Hanover Township and the recommendation of the Dauphin County Gaming Advisory Board.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT – WILLIAM TULLY, ESQ.

Mr. Tully: I have no changes to the draft report, but would be happy to answer any questions you might have. (There was none.)

CHIEF CLERK'S REPORT – J. SCOTT BURFORD

Mr. Burford: I have nothing to report, but would be happy to answer any questions. (There was none.)

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Hartwick: I would like to mention for the record about the reduction and the issue with the audit for Title IV-E in Pennsylvania. It is going to have a significant impact on the C&Y Budget. It seems like this is the perfect storm this year. While we were presented with a plan that showed minimal County increase yesterday, we are going back to the drawing board and we are actually putting on hold some plans to implement innovative new programs in order and in preparation for trying to sort of brace for that impact, which we are not sure what it is going to be. We are planning and are already putting a couple of things on hold in anticipation of that hitting us.

Mr. Haste: How does that impact the presentation we had last week?

Mr. Hartwick: That is exactly what we are talking about. There is a PILOT program...

Mr. Haste: Are we going to have another presentation with the new adjusted numbers?

Mr. Hartwick: When we find out what they are.

Mr. Haste: Will we get it ahead of time?

Mr. Hartwick: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Just a reminder that we have both Retirement Board and Prison Board today. We will try to convene the Retirement Board at 11:20.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk

Transcribed: Richie-Ann Martz