



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONERS WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 2007

10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff; Marie Rebuck, Controller; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; Tom Guenther, Director of Information Technology; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Sharon Chatman, Personnel; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Sandy Moore, Human Services Director; Edgar Cohen, Facility Maintenance Director; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Bob Christoff, Conservation District; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office; and Julia Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Garry Lenton, Patriot News; and Al Brulo, Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haste: We have four sets of Meeting Minutes that we'll take up next week.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Mr. Haste: Bob and Al would you please come forward?

A. Robert Christoff, Conservation District; Al Brulo & Matt Bonanno from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.

1. Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan for Dauphin County.

Mr. Christoff: I have two things to discuss today under the Act 167 Stormwater Plan. The first are the DEP contracts. In mid-December, I forwarded the Commissioners the contracts for funding from DEP to complete the Act 167 Plan. The Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan provides water quality, infiltration, channel protection and peak discharge standards to manage stormwater for whatever area it is covering. We coordinate the Plan at the county level. Once it is completed it falls back to the municipalities to implement those standards. Did you all get a map that I brought in this morning? (All of the Commissioners received a copy of the map.) Just to show you where we are at, the areas that are shaded, those plans have already been completed recently between 2003 and 2005. The area that this plan will cover is the area that is left in white; Mahantango Creek and Conewago drainage into the Swatara and direct drainage to the river. Once completed, then the entire County will fall under an Act 167 Plan.

Mr. Haste: Can you describe a little how DEP has changed the way they look at these plans?

Mr. Christoff: Historically DEP has done these plans on a watershed by watershed basis. The plans we recently completed are updates to previous plans where we had done the watershed by watershed. For instance, the first plan that we did was the Paxton Creek Watershed. Then we did Spring Creek and then we did a handful of watersheds under one plan. The approach they are taking now is to do this on a county-wide basis where the entire county is planned for under essentially one plan.

For us at this point, we're finishing up under the approach that we are not doing each of these remaining watersheds individually. But we will still have essentially six different plans when this is done. Assuming that approach continues into the future if we do an update, we will probably bring those all under one plan.

Mr. Haste: It would be in essence six sub-plans under one plan?

Mr. Christoff: Right, I would think that would be sub-componentized if you needed to update part of it for a rapidly developing area that you could do that without having to open the entire plan and update everything.

Mr. Haste: When we were sitting at the District, it seemed odd for us because everything has always been done by watershed up until this point in time. Now it is going on basically a political subdivision instead of a watershed. It is a complete different approach than the way that it has been handled in the past.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there a reason they are doing that because it seems like it is less logical? Each one of these watersheds would be unique and.....

Mr. Christoff: Within that overall plan you would still look at each watershed individually. I think there is a certain efficiency that you are doing one plan to cover the entire county.

Mr. Haste: I think if we were a county that didn't have these watershed plans together and we had to do the whole county, the cost would be substantially higher. I think from the County's perspective and a budget standpoint that would be a difficult thing if you had to do the whole county. Thank goodness we're up to speed.

Mr. Christoff: If you are doing the whole county as one unit versus doing the entire county watershed by watershed, I think that approach doing it holistically would be certainly more efficient.

Mr. Haste: Just so everybody understands it is not a new project just a new approach.

Mr. Christoff: Right. This is a recent change with DEP.

Mr. Haste: We may go back to the old way?

Mr. Brulo: I hope not.

Mr. Christoff: I hope they get some consistency. The updates are every five years. That doesn't mean that we will do an update in five years if it is not necessary. If it stays this way, it would probably be very efficient to be able to take out a piece of that plan. Say Beaver Creek may be developing very quickly and need an update rather than update the entire county plan. The contracts you have are for DEP funding to complete the project.

The other item was I also sent a recommendation from the Conservation District on selection of the engineer to provide the technical services. We will recommend to you to select Herbert, Rowland & Grubic. We requested proposals from ten different firms in the area. We got three back. The HRG proposal was significantly lower than the other two. I believe attached to your map there is a copy of the proposal summary.

Mr. Haste: Al you've done each one of these watersheds already, right?

Mr. Brulo: Right and that is why we're lower than the other firms from the standpoint of that we have a lot of data and models on board. We're familiar with working with the Conservation District with Bob and John. So we are very familiar with the county.

Mr. Haste: We will take action next week.

PERSONNEL

Mr. Haste: Let's do personnel first and then we'll move into salary board.

Ms. Sinner: I have a list of salary board requests and these include positions that were budgeted for 2007. I'm not sure how soon some of these are going to be filled. There really is not going to be too many. Are there any questions on any of the salary board items?

Mr. Haste: Does anyone have any questions on the packet? (There were none.)

Ms. Sinner: I have the personnel transactions and I also have an addendum for a transfer. There are a couple of items that I'm requesting a vote for today. They are in the original personnel transaction listing. I'm requesting a vote for items #4, 5, and item #2.

Mr. Hartwick: So that is items #2, 4 & 5?

Ms. Sinner: Correct. In the addendum, items #1 & 2.

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions? (There were none.) Is there a motion to approved items #2, 4, & 5 of the personnel packet and items #1 & 2 of the addendum?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to approve items #2, 4, & 5 of the personnel packet and items #1 & 2 of the addendum; motion carried.

Ms. Sinner: Also, I have a listing of the positions in the county and I talked to Marie about getting this approved this coming year. However, I have not removed Spring Creek from the listing yet. If you would rather wait and have a listing with those removed. We're currently in the process of taking them off the payroll system but I

haven't taken them off my position listing yet. We haven't done a salary board request to have them removed yet.

Mr. Haste: We should have those removed and start the year out clean.

Ms. Sinner: Then I could have an addendum to eliminate all of those positions from Spring Creek next week.

Mr. Saylor: Kay, make sure that you get with Mr. Yohe because we did create a couple of positions, Public Defenders; and make sure that you are coordinated with that.

Ms. Sinner: That I've already done.

Mr. Haste: Next week under salary board we'll take up the increases for the upcoming year as a result of the evaluation system that was in place. I know there are still some ongoing concerns with that.

Mr. Hartwick: I want to make a statement about the evaluation system. For the record, the evaluation system is supposed to be a year long process by which it is supposed to be used as a development tool for employees. It is not supposed to be done just for a one time shot. It is supposed to give an individual an opportunity to review a noble concept of the actual job description, the duties that they were hired to perform and to be able to evaluate them based upon their job description. This is not intended to be an end of the year reward. It is not supposed to be used as a way to gain any kind of good favor to bad employees. This is supposed to give an employee an evaluation based upon work performance of the office and a development tool in order to try to improve employee performance. That is supposed to be something that should be brought out on a quarterly basis, talked about, reviewed, correction action plan should be put into place for those individuals who are not performing adequately and it is not a way to adjust somebody's salary as a result of having the opportunity to have a merit based incentive to somebody's job evaluation. I want to be very clear with that because for the most part we're seeing some inconsistencies as to how some of these job descriptions and evaluations were done. Although there are some issues related to civil service persons, these are evaluations that we need to work out. I was made aware of these yesterday. The bottom line is the evaluations are done to try to gauge people based upon what they know and their job performance, not who they know and adjust it to make their salary a little bit more competitive with other departments. I want to make it very clear on the record that we've all been pretty tough on the directors and we've been trying to have them accountable to be managers. The people who are in management positions need to know how to manage people. That may not necessarily be the case. You're supposed to be able to evaluate the employee based upon what they are hired to do and provide an evaluation based upon their work performance. That is how it is supposed to be accomplished. They don't want to be the bad guy and don't want to complain about an employee. I don't want to hear from the directors who have not been able to actually give a fair evaluation and employees that are not performing adequately and they end up giving them the highest outstanding

recommendation. Those individual directors should be held accountable for not being good managers. Sometimes that means giving a lot of tough love. For those directors that continue to do that, they will be evaluated based upon their ability to do that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I echo Commissioner Hartwick's comments because one of the challenges with this type of process is that you have to be very clear on the standards that are set and what you put out. Unfortunately, I don't know if it was a breakdown on communication or what it was. I truly believe that every department was given adequate guidance in what our expectations were. But when I see results where the entire office has outstanding and commendable, better than 50% of most departments are outstanding and commendable while I do believe we have great people working for us, I don't believe the standard was met because I think when the Board set out to do this.....unfortunately, I think a lot of people look at satisfactory as a negative term. Whereas, to me a good employee who really knows their job, comes to work everyday, does it well, that's where they would be, in that satisfactory category. In order to get to that commendable or outstanding category, they would have to show some....maybe you're down two people in your office and that person really stepped up and learned other people's jobs. To hit that outstanding and commendable area, you better have a real good reason why they qualify for that with a positive note on their record. Unfortunately, because of the sheer number of outstanding and commendables I don't think the directors understood what we were looking for. I don't think they truly understood what this tool was all about in terms of what Commissioner Hartwick said. It is an opportunity to sit down with an employee, share with them some of the areas where they should work a little bit harder to be better at their job and pat them on the back for when they do a good job. It's not to re-establish in Dauphin County that the status of a good days work and good employee is outstanding. You have to stretch to reach that. Unfortunately, it did not come up. I'll give one example. Looking through these job evaluations, on one of them an individual had the ability to use office equipment, copy machines, fax machines and things of that nature, and they got an outstanding. Now, I'm sorry. You either do that or you don't do that. It is either satisfactory or it is not satisfactory. It is not outstanding! Yet, we're seeing areas where in fact, people are given outstanding ratings because they can use a copy machine. Now that goes twofold. One it says a director's standards wouldn't match the Board's; but number two it also tells us that we've got to tweak this down. It is a process that we believe in and a process that we truly have strived to implement in Dauphin County. It is not right yet. We're starting to tweak it to get to where it is right. There are certain areas where it should be, does the job or doesn't do the job as opposed to maybe a broad range. I for one think that we also need to basically have three categories rather than five categories. There should be a "needs improvement" a "commendable" and if they are exceeding that an "outstanding". There is some trouble. I think what is going to happen is and I know I personally want to meet with some of these department heads to go over what their standard was so I can better understand it. But at the end of the day, if some of these stand as they are here and if we can't come to terms and I do believe some of those department heads will be coming into the salary board and trying to justify the increases that this evaluation is tied to. I don't know how any of the other board members feel but I'm not satisfied with this. I'm not satisfied with this at all.

Again, that is not to put down anybody. The intent was never to give percentage increases above and beyond what the historical trend was but it was in fact to identify merit where it was due and when somebody really exceeded expectations, to try to give them something for exceeding expectations. In looking at this I don't know what the actual percentage is but I bet 50% of the people on this list exceeded the expectations, at least 50%.

Mr. Hartwick: We've even offered training to directors. We offered specific training to directors to understand what the evaluation forms are about, what the requirements were, and what we wanted them to do. The individuals who gave outstanding and never even filled out the forms.....

Mr. DiFrancesco: Right.

Mr. Hartwick: They checked outstanding on each one and there is no reason or explanation behind it. They put it in and they expect to get a higher increase for that. That is absolutely unacceptable.

Mr. Di Francesco: I will not be supporting an extra increment for anybody who has not done this properly. You are right there, a lot of them where there was no comment given for outstanding. That was part of the rules. If you put outstanding down and you didn't put a comment down, it is not an outstanding it is satisfactory. Again people need to follow the rules and I'm going to assume out of courtesy to everybody that it was again a miscommunication standard or whatever it might be because if it was anything other than that...if it was individuals looking to this as an opportunity to, as Commissioner Hartwick said, bump salaries or whatever in their office, then they are irresponsible with their leadership and the positions they hold.

Mr. Haste: I think what we ought to do is communicate that between now and next week to the directors. For those areas where the evaluation process was not followed, it would be my inclination that those individuals get 4%. I think that needs to be communicated to the department heads and elected officials. We have been talking about department heads but a couple of elected officials thumbed their nose at the process. If that's the case and they chose not to be part of the team and stake out their independence, then that's the way it will go.

Mr. DiFrancesco: If I could just add, again it would be very disheartening that people would think low of this process because at the end of the day, this form serves two purposes. It serves the purpose to allow the department head or elected official to communicate with their employees what is going on, how they are doing, how they can improve; but secondly it tells us that the person responsible for the salary increases and spending of the money is fiscally responsible, it is a tool for us to do our job. So if they thumb their nose at us looking to do our job that probably wouldn't be in their best interest because again the salary board has the ultimate say in what goes next and we need some sort of a tool to help guide us in that process. If they thumb their nose and

declare their independence so be it; but then for their employees the merit increase goes out the window. It is very simple.

Ms. Fisher: Do you want us to put this project on hold until these issues are resolved? In order to make the pay increases effective January 1, we have to start processing all this information tomorrow. We have from Thursday to Tuesday to complete the project. We can put it on hold but that is going to delay.....

Mr. Haste: We are not in a position to act today. If we don't resolve this by next week when the salary board will meet, I think certain departments that followed through, we'll move forward with their increases. Those who decided not to follow the evaluation process, I think that gets put on hold. I know that makes your job a little more difficult.

Ms. Fisher: It doesn't make it more difficult it is just that the process will be delayed. People will not see their salary increases in the next check.

Mr. Haste: They shouldn't be surprised. We've talked about this evaluation system from day one. There are those who continue to think that it doesn't apply to them. If they chose to not have the evaluation system apply to them, then they will get the standard increase and nothing more.

Mr. Saylor: Shall I direct an email to the directors advising them that we will be scrutinizing this and it may cause a delay in increases?

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Saylor: Should I advise them also that they may be hearing directly from you?

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Hartwick: We can go through this list and talk about the departments. It is not that hard to see.

Mr. Haste: When I see departments that have 73% of their employees with outstanding, I expect them to never have a problem.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The other sad part about this is for the departments that really took the time to do it right and give an outstanding person the true outstanding mark, that person ends up getting lost in the system when other departments decided that they are just going to give everybody an outstanding and not comment and think about it too much. The shame of it is the ones that are working very hard in doing their job above and beyond expectations, they get lost. It is a shame because there are a lot of very good people who will do anything to get the job done. I'm sure they are meeting that outstanding mark. Looking at this you don't meet outstanding by being able to use the copy machine in an outstanding way.

Mr. Haste: I think next week if we could all give it a thought. I know a couple of department heads came to me with good intentions and suggested that for next year to tweak this so we have a committee of some department heads and others to take a look at it. Some of the exact recommendations you made, such as take a look at this and make a recommendation on how we can improve the process. One of the things that you mentioned that you brought up were good ideas. I think the process is a good step in the right direction. We may want to make certain categories for instance, like using office equipment, you can get an outstanding on that and then say it is dealing with the clients or answering customer service, may be a satisfactory. Shouldn't the customer service be weighted more than being able to use a machine? There may be in each department other recommendations that the department heads weigh certain areas so that servicing the client and working a typewriter isn't of equal value. I think that will improve the process next year.

Ms. Fisher: There are a lot of suggestions that we can make to improve the process. It was a major step just trying to get the directors to do this. You see what issues we have with it.

Mr. Haste: I would say 60-70% of the department heads did the right thing and I want to commend them and thank them for that. As in everything else, there are a few who just refuse to go along.

Mr. Hartwick: I know Personnel did a lot of work to get the job descriptions, to get these forms together and to make sure the process went smoothly. They were done on time. They stayed on everybody's back. The amount of phone calls to get them in. There certainly was a lot of work and I want to thank you for staying through the process.

Ms. Fisher: Is there anything else? (There was nothing.)

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: I have no report this week. I would like to explain. We were not able to enter the 2007 requisitions until 2007 and since the first day of work was yesterday, it wasn't enough time to get all the items entered in a report and generated. We will have that for next week. We'll get you the report on Monday instead of Tuesday so that you will have plenty of time to review it.

In all seriousness, as you were discussing the evaluation system, I hear everything that you are saying and speaking as just one department head, I think the process was a good thing. I think there are improvements that we can all make. Seriously, I know myself, I would really like to take part of that group because I think that it is a good thing and if we could tweak it like you mentioned. I think I was obviously one of the ones that Commissioner Haste was talking about that had a lot of comments and a lot of concerns about it. I think the issue of weighing items is real important. If you do form a group, I would love to be part of that.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: There is nothing that needs to be addressed today.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Haste: We do have a request from the Prison to implement the wages for the captains and lieutenants. It is an upgrade for 2007 wages in place for the captains and lieutenants which are a meet and discuss unit. They were union, then they went non-union and they are recognized as a meet and discuss unit. This was as a result of negotiations with them.

- A. Revision to Dauphin County Prison Policies for Captains and Lieutenants (Revised Section 31 Wages).
(*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 01/03/07)**

Mr. Saylor: May I ask one thing that occurred to me and pointed this out for the Warden, Dave, I think there is no signature page on here. Is this something that we and representatives need to sign?

Mr. Schreiber: No.

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions? (There were none.)

Mr. Saylor: For the record, this has been reviewed by personnel staff and labor counsel.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve a Revision to Dauphin County Prison Policies for Captains and Lieutenants (Revised Section 31 Wages); motion carried.

- B. Approval of the renewal rates with Harleysville Life Insurance to provide Dauphin County employees insurance.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

There was no report.

CHIEF CLERK'S REPORT

Mr. Saylor: I have one item. The IRS has increased the reimbursement for mileage as it seems they do every year. So we are working on language for a resolution for you guys for next week.

Mr. Saylor: Are there any questions? (There were none.)

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Haste: Is there anything that needs to be brought up before the Board? (There was nothing.)

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? (There was none.)

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to adjourn the meeting; motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk
January 3, 2007