



**DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**WORKSHOP MEETING**

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2005**

**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; Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Robert Dick, Treasurer; Ed Marsico, Esq., District Attorney; Tom Guenther, Information Technology Director; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Sandy Moore, Human Services Director; Jennifer Storm, Victim Witness Director; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; President Judge Joseph Kleinfelter; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Noel Falk, Special Projects Coordinator; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; Mike Pries, Security Director; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office; and Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Jack Sherzer, Patriot News

**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 will take up at next week's Meeting.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: We are 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)

## **PERSONNEL**

### A. Personnel Packet:

Ms. Sinner: In the personnel packet, I have three Salary Board requests. The first two are the elimination of two positions. The third is the elimination of a full-time position at Schaffner Youth Center. It is a Youth Program Specialist I in order to create a Youth Program Specialist Aide. Due to the qualifications of the person being hired if they don't qualify for one position they may qualify for an aide position. We have the vacancies listing. The new hire listing is the Spring Creek employees. The changes listing is noted. We have the overtime report and a request for overtime at the Prison and that is for Pay Period #3.

### B. Proposed non-union pay scales for 2005

### C. Proposed non-union pay increases for 2005

Ms. Fisher: Each of you have been provided with a copy of the 2005 Pay Scales as well as a listing of all non-union employees excluding those that fall under the courts for 2005 as well. I just had a conversation with the President Judge and he told me that they would comply with the same format that we will with all other employees. I will have a listing of the court employees to all of you before the next meeting. The scales that you have before you are again for the non-union employees. They include the professional staff, line staff, the directors and the nurse management staff at Spring Creek as well as the part-timers.

It is my understanding that we will do the process of the salary increases in two phases. The first phase is what you have before you. I've applied a 2% cost of living increase to all of the pay scales giving all employees a 2% increase effective January 3, 2005. The second phase of the process will be in July and will be a 2% increase based on merit. Department Directors will be asked to complete performance evaluations on all of their

non-union employees to determine what kind of increase the employees should receive in July.

Mr. Hartwick: Will be required!

Ms. Fisher: Will be required and not asked.

Mr. Haste: I think, Chad between you and Faye, it needs to be made clear that those evaluations need to be done. Quite frankly, if they're not done, that tells me the director is not doing their job and the director will not receive an increase.

Mr. Saylor: We are having a Director's Meeting next week to go over this and the Board has made crystal clear to me that not only are the non-bargaining employees are to receive the review but the directors are to be reviewed by their oversight and myself. At the last Director's Meeting in November, we made this clear that this was on the horizon. So we will follow up next week.

Mr. Hartwick: Also, Faye and I are working out the evaluation system as recommended by Mr. Flannery basing our evaluations on job performance, versus job description, versus our current system of pay for performance which is something that we agreed is much fairer. I've set a deadline that I was going to put before the Board of April, that we were requiring people to submit that so that we are in a position to understand what those are from all of our oversight perspectives. We want them to be submitted to us and anything above or below.....could you explain that Faye?

Ms. Fisher: The way the policy is written all employees who receives an overall rating of needs improvement only receives a 2% cost of living increase. Those employees who receive an overall rating of satisfactory would get the full 4%. Those who exceed expectations would get the 4% but the department directors would have the opportunity to request an additional increase up to 2% for those employees as long as they stay within that 4% budget.

Mr. Haste: Chad, when you have your director's meeting, some of the directors understand and know how to do that, others take the easy way out and make every employee an excellent employee because they don't have the "hutzpah" to do what they are supposed to be doing. If I see that, I'm not going to go with that because there ought to be something that looks a little bit more like a bell curve where you have the core of your employees, you have a few that exceed and a few who don't. If I come in and see anybody with everybody in their department exceeds, that tells me that director again isn't worth their salt.

Mr. Hartwick: Faye, our messages sound pretty consistent. The idea is that if we go for future firing of an employee and we see nothing but exceeds expectations for performance and then we fire this employee, and we ask the director to justify these evaluations, and they say, "you didn't have to work with that person every day". Ultimately, your job as a director is not to be somebody's best friend. It is to give an

honest evaluation and use it as a tool for development and to let people know what the expectations are, where they need to improve as they move along. The directors will be held accountable for these evaluations.

Ms. Fisher: Okay.

Mr. Saylor: May I note for the record, obviously, we can impact this directly with the directors. With the courts and the elected officials that have independent authority, the communication with Carolyn is to discuss this and to get them to participate in this as well. You can get their input as to when we implement the policy what their thoughts are and see if they would be willing to join us in doing this across the board.

Mr. Haste: Again, if they don't it will bite them in the behind when they come to discipline an employee because if you don't have the proper documentation, there is going to be a problem.

Ms. Fisher: Are there any other questions on the 2005 Pay Scales?

Mr. Haste: You don't need action today?

Ms. Fisher: No I don't.

Mr. Haste: We'll take this up next week.

Ms. Fisher: Yes.

Mr. Haste: We don't have this on the schedule but, Your Honor, do you want to address the Board at this point?

President Judge Kleinfelter: Just a fast postscript to the last issue that you discussed. I am a strong proponent of a pay for performance policy. What I hear from the Board is something that I think the Courts totally wish to embrace. I can't speak of course for Judge Lewis, my successor but from what I know, I think you will have total cooperation from us. I agree, I had to smile when you said, it takes a certain amount of "hutzpah" to do an objective evaluation. As you, Commissioner Hartwick, said you can't always be someone's best friend in the process. If the evaluations are to be meaningful at all, they truly have to be objective.

I just came forward for a moment to speak to a memo which I sent to the Commissioners and of course, I'm also speaking to Marie Rebeck in her capacity as a member of the Salary Board, dealing with a clerk/crier position which I have asked again to be submitted for a vote at the Legislative Meeting next week. In the memo, I copied you with a memo from January 14, 2003. At that time, we had presented this position to the Board. The Board had attentively approved it but there were some issues dealing with the union since one of the positions was a union position and we had hoped to see some resolution in the months that had followed. A year has gone by

and there really has been no agreement. Just to move this forward, I would like to have the Board consider it next week. Although I think the memorandum is fairly thorough, the highlights of it are that we eliminate two positions, create one position, and the new combined position resulted in a savings of about \$4,700. That's on the money side of it. On the purpose side of it, is the need to have a skilled person in the courtroom at the time depositions are made to be able to implement a computer system that allows depositions to be entered as part of the Common Pleas Case Management System when we come on line. Some of the folks that are in these positions now, probably don't have the skills that we would like them to have in that regard. It will be a transition. This will affect eight judges. But I would only expect two or three of those to actually fill the position and then through a period of attrition over the next twelve months or so fill the positions as they become available. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them now.

Mr. Haste: I'm scanning through this. If my memory is right, there is a part-time and a full-time position being eliminated to create one full-time.

President Judge Kleinfelter: That is correct.

Mr. Haste: Wasn't one or two of these positions out of the Clerk of Courts and maybe the Prothonotary's Office?

President Judge Kleinfelter: The part-time position that you referenced is the position of the court clerk. Our court clerks actually are in a unique situation in that they work both for the Prothonotary and the Clerk of Courts. So that to give you an example, my clerk, Ben Valmor, when there is a criminal court session, he's working for Lowell Witmer. When there is a civil court session, he's working for Steve Farina. Somehow or another, they split that budget between those two offices for these clerk positions.

Mr. Haste: Organizationally, where do they fall? What I'm thinking about is an administrative function in that, do I need to include the Prothonotary and Clerk of Courts as part of the Salary Board because are we eliminating something that is organizationally on their charts? Faye is saying, "yes".

President Judge Kleinfelter: I would agree with that. I think when we actually take a vote next week, the mechanics of it would be that I would be part of the Salary Board to eliminate the court position and then Steve and Lowell should somehow be involved in that vote to eliminate their position. They are in favor of this.

Mr. Haste: Chad, can you make sure they are notified and they know that it is on the agenda?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Faye, I was looking over the sheet and on page 7 of the non-union increases, third from the bottom, could you review and check on that to determine, it is one of those cases where technically he doesn't work for the County or whatever.

Ms. Fisher: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I don't know what impact it has.

## **PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci: As I told you last week, I don't have a purchase order packet yet but we are working on entering those. You will have one in plenty of time for next week's meeting to review. I wanted to direct your attention to Item A on the Items for Discussion, that asks for a vote. There is a typo, it says, agreement between Dauphin County Solid Waste, it is just between Dauphin County. What that is, two years ago we did a bid for trash removal for the County for all of the buildings that are outside of the City of Harrisburg. The ones that are located in the City, the City has to pick up the trash. The other buildings, we did a bid for trash removal. It was a two year bid with an option for a third year. All that I'm asking here is that you approve exercising the option for the third year. I discussed it with Solicitor Tully and he said that all you would need to do is take the action and Chad could send a letter saying that we are going to take the third year. Because when we did do a bid, we received bids from both York Waste and Waste Management, the two big haulers. York Waste was considerably less to a tune of about \$20,000 a year. I think it behooves us to take the option for the third year and next year it will come up for a new two or three year bid. I would like to exercise that option. We are suppose to give them a sixty day notice. The Contract renews March 1<sup>st</sup>. If you could vote on that today and just have it reflect Dauphin County instead of Dauphin County Solid Waste.

## **TRAINING PACKET**

Mr. Haste: We don't need to vote on anything for the training packet?

Mr. Saylor: No.

## **DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS**

A. *Ed Marsico, District Attorney and Jennifer Storm, Victim Witness Director*

1. *Grant to Encourage Arrest and Enforcement of Protection from Abuse Orders.*

Mr. Marsico: We are here today to talk about a grant proposal. I'll let Jennifer begin.

Ms. Storm: This is the same grant that I came before you about a year ago on behalf of my office, the Sheriff's Department and Pre-Trial and Bail. We didn't get the grant because of Pre-Trial and Bail's involvement. We didn't realize because of the intensive

offender management that they do, the Office Violence Against Women didn't want that piece in the grant. We revisited the grant. It is a really good grant. It is a grant that has no match. It is a two year grant with continuation of funding. I really wanted to try to go after it again. I talked to Ed about possibly incorporating his office and then incorporating a detective with Harrisburg City Police Department. We are looking at reapplying with my position the same, getting on one staff person, then with Ed and then Harrisburg City Police Department having one detective.

Mr. Marsico: The detective would be with the Harrisburg City Police. The money for my office would go to two different positions. One would go to partially fund an existing attorney position. We have historically had an attorney position funded in my office by what is called a STOP Grant, Stop Violence Against Women. It is sometimes known as VAWA, Violence Against Women Act. That money has been dwindling over the last five-six years to the point now where we get maybe \$20,000 toward an attorney's salary. It is a good chance that money might go away completely in the next year or two. We are not asking to fund a new attorney position. We're actually asking for money to partially fund that position. The other function from my office would be, we currently have Sally Krasevic who is a woman who works in my office twenty hours a week part-time, who is our Domestic Violence Coordinator. She basically plays the role of working very closely with Jennifer's office when PFAs are filed. A lot of times at the same time there are criminal charges filed and simple assaults. She coordinates with Victim Witness all those matters. She also coordinates all the PFAs. Someone violates Protection from Abuse Order, our office is responsible for prosecuting what is called an ICC, an Indirect Criminal Content. Sally has become very overwhelmed in her position. As part of my budget proposal last year, I had asked to make her position full-time. Obviously, with the state of the County finances that was not possible. I've been begging and working for any type of funding to fund that extra twenty hours. Jennifer has worked with Sally in her demands. We've had a child abuse coordinator for several years who has done all of this in a child abuse setting. It works out well. In domestic violence, we sort of need the same thing. Once we have a couple more attorneys to handle all those cases. This is the better way to go. That is really the aspect of it from our perspective.

Mr. Haste: There are no new positions?

Mr. Marsico: There will be a part-time position moved into a full-time position should we get the grant. No new positions. It will be a financial gain for the County those two years.

Mr. Hartwick: You say this is a continuation of funding. What happens after the two years are up?

Ms. Storm: After two years you can reapply. The continuation seems to be pretty consistent. If they have a program that they funded that has done well, they'll continue to fund it. This money seems pretty secure as opposed to the STOP Grant money which is going to competitive solicitation.

Mr. Hartwick: A secure government financing?

Ms. Storm: As secure as any of it is really.

Mr. Haste: The funds that you were talking about that are dwindling, where are they from?

Mr. Marsico: They come from PCCD but actually they are federal dollars that are followed through PCCD.

Ms. Storm: It used to be earmarked direct to counties and now the next year they're going to competitive solicitation. Each county will have to compete for one pool of funding as opposed to being given a certain amount.

Mr. Marsico: It had been done by a formula. I honestly don't know how it was. It was sort of by class of counties. Third class counties always seemed to get about the same amount of money. That money has gone to create Sally Krasevic position as Domestic Violence Coordinator. It has always paid for partially a DA's salary and some of that money also goes to the City and to the Y. We are a pass through in that respect for those agencies. There has been some real problems with the funding stream in the last two years. Our state-wide association is taking an active stance to try to make sure that it is maintained. There are no guarantees out there.

Mr. Haste: Do you need a letter of support from us or do we actually sign a grant application?

Ms. Storm: Probably sign the grant application which I'll have ready for you Thursday or Friday. It is technically due next week. There were a couple of things I needed your signature as Chairman. I forwarded them to Jule.

Mr. Hartwick: Do you need a motion?

Mr. Marsico: Yes.

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve a Grant Application for an Encourage Arrest and Enforcement of Protection from Abuse Orders Project; motion carried.**

*B. Sandy Moore, Human Services Director*

*1. Presentation regarding the State Hospital closing.*

Ms. Moore: I have with me Dan Eisenhauer. He is our Deputy Mental Health Director for the County.

Mr. Hartwick: Also our representative on the Collaborative Board.

Ms. Moore: I thank you all for the opportunity to talk about what we know and what we don't know about the proposal to close Harrisburg State Hospital. I apologize for Barry Wyrick, who is in Washington with his brother, who is having surgery today. I thought because this is becoming a more complicated process than we originally anticipated. I thought a power point would help you and me walk through what information we have to share with you.

What we anticipate with the Harrisburg State Hospital is that the Department of Public Welfare will be announcing their proposal to close the hospital tomorrow within thirty days and they actually have a tentative date for the 19<sup>th</sup> of January. There needs to be a public hearing regarding their plans to close. They anticipate the closure to happen within eighteen months. As you all probably know there was a meeting called last week, by now, Senator Vance and Senator Piccola that pulled together local legislators from the seven counties that are impacted by this along with mental health professionals and county commissioners to talk about how this would impact the counties. One of the results of that was going to be a letter drafted by Senator Vance and Senator Piccola with all the legislators and commissioners hopefully signing on asking the Department of Public Welfare to actually take the thirty days to have the public hearing rather than having it on the 19<sup>th</sup> so that communities would have the full amount of time to pull together whatever kind of response they needed for that public hearing. So we anticipate that very shortly.

Mr. Hartwick: That letter was signed yesterday and was sent over to the Department of Public Welfare I guess yesterday afternoon.

Ms. Moore: Wonderful.

Mr. Haste: Does that mean there will be a series of hearings or are they going to hold the record open for thirty days?

Ms. Moore: My understanding is there is an actual public hearing that will happen within that thirty days. I don't understand that it is a series. It is one public hearing.

Mr. Haste: They will allow people to make comments during that thirty day period?

Ms. Moore: I believe so.

Mr. Hartwick: That was correct. I believe any comments should be submitted and that's why they were asking for the window, a full thirty days for us to be able to allow for public comment for counties to sort of group up and discuss best strategies for any transition and allow us to get with the mental health providers in the community to provide any feedback and be proactive in trying to get together a public meeting in that time. We think that all counties have requested the full thirty days.

Ms. Moore: The counties that are impacted that we are aware of are: Adams, York, Cumberland, Perry, Franklin, Fulton and Dauphin County. How that is going to impact Dauphin County, at least what we are anticipating is currently we average between 83-86 patients at the Harrisburg State Hospital. We anticipate that approximately 40 of those will be the identified number for us to reintegrate into our community. Others, the remaining folks, will be moved to other state hospitals. We don't know which hospitals. There are union implications and all kinds of things that the state department has to deal with so while we have suspicions which hospitals those will be, we've been asked not to talk about those yet.

Mr. Haste: The 86 number that you use, are they residents of the county or are those folks who have been in our system?

Ms. Moore: Those are residents of Dauphin County who have been sent to Harrisburg State Hospital through our system.

What I wanted to talk a little about was our past efforts. Dauphin County of all the seven counties has had probably the most experience, possibly York close to us, in moving people out of the state hospital system through a CHIPP initiative. Dan knows what that stands for if you actually want to know. Basically over the past years, we've moved approximately 91 people out of the state hospital. Most of those have been in large groups. The largest number that we removed at one time was 38 people within a year. As of October 2004, so in the past ten years, what has happened with those folks? One of the things that is very concerning to me as Human Service Director, was how many of the people coming out of the state hospital actually end up in our prison system. I asked that we look at that very carefully. Of those 91, two folks ended up in our county prison system. I know that we have a lot of folks that have mental health issues in our county prison system but this is specific to people who have been in the state hospital and have come out. One of the things we're going to be asking the state for is a waiver for any of the folks, those 40 people that we move out, if they end up in our prison system hopefully that will not happen but if that does happen, we want to use those state dollars that they are giving us to be able to continue providing treatment and get those people out of our prison system as quickly as possible. That would require a waiver for us to be able to do that because as you know and folks go into our county prison system we can't use our mental health dollars to give them the treatment services that they still desperately need even in the prison system.

Mr. Haste: These numbers almost indicate that the state hospital system is working.

Ms. Moore: That it is working?

Mr. Haste: If you look at it and I never really thought of it this way, but when I start looking at those numbers and what they mean. When you told me the number 2, that surprised me because of the number of mental health issues that we have at the prison. When you look at this and those that have either come out and gotten themselves in trouble, is very few. It appears that those who have gotten through the system, the

system is working. I guess what would raise some concern is if it is working then why is the state trying to do away with it?

Ms. Moore: I guess a twist to that in my thinking would be the people who end up in the state hospital system are the most severe mentally ill people. I would say that when they come out of the state mental hospital system, we wrap services around so tightly and there are so many services, intensive services, to provide to them that, yes, it's been more successful once they come out. I would say that unfortunately, the rest of our mental health system doesn't have the intensity of services that are needed so a lot of those people before they get to that extreme place where they have to be in the state hospital end up in systems that are ready to service them. Part of it we hope to deal with this in our negotiations, is ask for additional dollars to bolster up our system that helps those people before they ever get to the state hospital. That's really the key to insuring that we have mental health services that are appropriate and adequate in Dauphin County.

Mr. Haste: I think that is critical because you are going to know you've identified roughly 86. So those 86 you are going to track and they are in the system now. What about the ones that come into the system, not in these 18 months, but in the month 20 from now? Are we going to be able to identify that person and wrap those same services around that individual?

Ms. Moore: Part of our negotiating dollar figure with DPW will be to expand what our current mental health system is so we can do exactly what you are saying. That all has to be negotiated and that's all going to be part of our discussions that we have with DPW when we are talking dollar amounts. I'm being a little evasive because I don't want to talk publicly what our dollar amounts are with DPW before we get into negotiations with them.

What would we need for the closure? One of the other things we are saying is our support for the closure is contingent on having adequate funds to make a successful transition for not only these folks but to expand our mental health services in Dauphin County because now we will only have 40 beds to be utilizing in the state hospital system. So we are going to have other kinds of resources for folks who may need some intensive short term kinds of services but we don't have state hospital beds available for them. Dan can talk about what some of those other kinds of residential programming would look like.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Again 40 beds? Is that all the state offers?

Ms. Moore: Right now it is 83. We are using 86.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Where will those 40 beds be?

Ms. Moore: At other state hospitals.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How many are there and where are they?

Mr. Eisenhauer: There are currently nine state hospitals in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They are geographically scattered. Mayview is western Pennsylvania. Warren is northwestern Pennsylvania. Wernersville, Danville and Harrisburg are three hospitals in about a 70 mile radius. There is South Mountain Restoration Center located in south central PA, Norristown in the Philadelphia area, and the Allentown State Hospital. Those are the only remaining state mental hospitals. DPW has not yet announced where beds will be relocated. When they talk about closing Harrisburg State Hospital it doesn't mean that Dauphin County residents will have no state hospital. It just means that we'll have less beds at a different state hospital.

Mr. DiFrancesco: When you use that number, 40, is that like a pre-assigned thing?

Mr. Eisenhauer: No, it has not yet been decided. These are estimates. We've been actually planning for a number of years doing multiple levels of assessment of people's needs and resources needed to discharge people. We've no information yet because DPW hasn't made an official announcement. We're just guessing right now based on our own assessments that they are done in cooperation with state hospital employees. We're guessing that Dauphin County will probably be told that we believe that 40 beds will be transferred elsewhere and the remaining folks can be discharged to the community. That number may change plus or minus five.

Mr. Hartwick: These numbers will come as a result of our conversation with DPW staff.

Mr. Haste: Again one of my concerns is, dealing with folks at Dauphin County Prison, we have used two of those facilities on a regular basis, Norristown and Mayview. Of late, it has been shifted more to Mayview only because that's where beds were available. There are issues that come up at the prison that it is best to get folks out of that environment into somewhere else. We made an inquiry last week on moving someone potentially to Mayview and were told last week that there is a four to six week wait. Whereas, a month ago there was not a wait. One of my concerns, are people already starting to be shifted? That is telling me there is going to be a problem in the system. In this case where there is someone incarcerated and they are in a condition and need to be moved to a state hospital, if we have to wait four to six weeks chances are something else is happening either something bad has happened with that individual or they finally got them to take their meds and changed around. Four to six weeks really cuts us out of the picture. It is really not an option for us any more.

Ms. Moore: Based on our current capacity, there is no way we could handle these folks. We have to build some pretty significant expansions to our service delivery system here in Dauphin County with some significant cost associated with that for this to be successful. Our hope is to expand our mental health system beyond just these people. Our expectation with DPW is to expand our mental health system so that we can deal with some of those folks who aren't necessarily out of the state hospital but our folks that we know need help in our County.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Will you be addressing in this presentation long term needs as well? You're expectations how this impacts us long term? I won't ask the question if you will be getting to it.

Ms. Moore: In the section that talks about unknowns. Obviously, we talked about wanting to expand our own mental health system. One of the things that we've seen from past closures of state hospitals is that communities who have fought against the closure really have struggled with funding and building up their systems. If we really believe that this is not an appropriate thing to do and folks couldn't safely come out into this community, we would not support this absolutely. But we believe if we get the right resources and we have the time and ability to create what is needed for these folks, they can be successful in our community. You see that from our past history with the people that we brought out.

Mr. Haste: The only reason that I will hold my tongue is because I don't share that same feeling.

Ms. Moore: You see the prison system and you see a different population. What don't we know? We don't know exactly, but have some sort of idea about what type of services would be most helpful to the folks coming out. Until we know who those people are, we aren't going to know what kind of exact services need to be wrapped around them. We also, as you know have scheduled a public hearing for providers and consumers of services for Dauphin County on January 12<sup>th</sup>. Until we hear from them and what their ideas are, it is pretty difficult for us to list out every service need that these folks and their families will need. Until we know exactly what services are needed we don't know exactly what the cost associated with them will be. Although again we have some rough estimates.

You asked about ongoing services. The state from my perspective is pretty motivated to give us whatever assistance we need today to get these people out of the state hospital into the community. My concern is ongoing funding and will there be enough to continue to support the kinds of services not only that we need for these people coming out but also for our infrastructure. We have to talk about that with DPW. As you know funding is always a concern and what is given to you today may not necessarily be there two years from now and we need to have some conversations. That was probably one of the primary concerns that was addressed with Senator Piccola and Senator Vance at their meeting. One of the things that we asked for was significant support from them regarding not this year's funding, but ongoing funding.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there an example in the past of closures where some sort of mechanism was used for long term funding?

Ms. Moore: I think the examples from previous state hospitals is that those people reintegrated into the community were funded sufficiently to be successful in the community. We're going to be asking for a lot more than that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Going back to Commissioner Haste's comments, that's great we take care of 46 people to come out today, but as we move forward there is going to be constant need for people for beds and the beds won't be available and now we want to keep those people in the community.

Ms. Moore: Our intention is to get the money to be able to take care of some of Commissioner Haste's concerns. I'm not going to say 100% because there is no guarantee. But we are certainly going to fight for that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The difficulty here is that we can move forward with support of this very carefully and cautiously, it's too early to be critical but I'm very concerned.

Mr. Haste: Right.

Ms. Moore: As am I.

Mr. Haste: The State's track record is not real good on this area. Name one program that started with a certain amount of commitment; whereas ten years later that same level of commitment is not there.

Ms. Moore: Commissioner, as Human Service Director, I know exactly what you are saying. That's a concern of mine.

Mr. DiFrancesco: There is no guarantee and of course we continue to be sort of a dumping ground of programs that the state no longer wants to fund. Notice I said a dumping ground of programs and not of any individual who needs resources from the County. We want to take care of the people in this community. We want to provide top notch services. The problem is, it is one thing to say there is a more efficient way to do something, there is another thing for the Commonwealth to say, we have a limitation on money, we want to spend our money elsewhere. You take care of this. That's a problem.

Ms. Moore: I agree. That certainly was the number one problem or concern that we expressed to Senator Vance and Senator Piccola. It is an unknown.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Hopefully that will be cleared up before we make our final decision whether or not we do battle.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, to make a final decision to do battle. I don't think there is anybody on this Board who doesn't oppose the closing of the state hospital. We're not in support of this closing. When we heard about the five year mental health plan here, this Board of Commissioners sat here and expressively stated that we think that is the wrong thing to do. The problem is and I think we all remain very committed to saying, we would love to see the hospital remain by the numbers it has been working. The option of closing this is not our decision to make. We're being told that the State Hospital is closing with

or without our support. It appears that it is going to happen. How do we best position ourselves to deal with that problem? I think that once that decision has been made it is our position. How do we do that? That is what we are talking about. That is what we are considering everything that we can within our power. You know my trying to negotiate to gain the resources in that capacity. We are trying to be inclusive of everyone's comments and concerns of the Board of Commissioners. I don't think that there is anybody who sits on this Board that wants to see the State Hospital close. No one wants to have it misconstrued that we do.

Ms. Moore: I think we shared with you in that meeting that was called last week. Senator Vance certainly had the same feeling that her assessment was that this was happening. Senator Piccola had that feeling. The representatives of other counties had that feeling. I don't think it is just Dauphin County feeling that this is going to happen and it just is. I think just about everybody who has heard and has been involved and has done some research in looking at other state hospitals and what the closure process of those has been are pretty much the same opinion. The critical point now is that we have the resources, not only initially but ongoing to support these folks and support the infrastructure that we need in our communities to make sure that we have those resources and people don't end up in our prisons.

Mr. Haste: I would feel a little more comfortable when the Governor is as passionate about this as he is with SEPTA or Comcast.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, we need to figure out a way within this process to make sure that we gain public commitment on resources in this process before the decision is made to close. Ultimately, I don't want to do anything that is going to say and have Dauphin County in the position when this is closed, that they pitch a tent in Market Square and end up at the prison. We have a responsibility to these folks to make sure that we provide the network of services that does not jeopardize public safety. Sandy is going to talk about the screening process, who is going to be brought back into the community but that is something you have not heard a lot about. We are very concerned about public safety for the individuals who are being brought out of the state hospital. How are they going to be transitioned? How are they going to be tracked? Who is going to be out of the 86 transitioned out of the state hospital? We are going to be very careful with this screening process. I don't want to make statements that are going to put us so far in opposition in this thing that we don't have the leverage to come to the table and provide that support network. That's truly my concern.

Ms. Moore: Part of this conversation is to walk through with you all what our thinking has been. If there is anything that we are missing before we sit down at the table with DPW, we have that on our list of things to have conversations about with them. I appreciate your comments.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Stress, I agree, we do have a responsibility to make sure these people are taken care of adequately. We have a commitment to do that. I just don't want DPW to lose sight that they also have a responsibility to make sure these people

are adequately taken care of and that it is just not a philosophy where they can say yes we care about these people, now you do it. There is a track record there on part of the Commonwealth. I'm not stressing now just in this particular piece but on part of the Commonwealth to take responsibilities and shift them. We see it in the transportation infrastructure. We see it in a lot of different ways where people say, sorry no money, you take care of it. Yet, they won't give us funding mechanisms to take care of it. I just want to say when we are sitting at the table, let's make absolutely certain that we all have pieces of responsibility and the long term commitment of funding is critical.

Mr. Hartwick: I share your cynicism, pain, everything has rolled down hill for the County. I completely agree. Even further more, to your agreement, the Department of Public Welfare faces a \$1.5 billion shortfall this year in Medicare. That's something that is on everybody's radar screen. As we are looking at these issues, we need to figure out how we gain those commitments and do them publicly and do that through this process. There are struggles and problems with the way they are going to pay for a number of problems at DPW. It is a huge budget and some huge problems. We're mindful of that as we sit down at the table.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The other challenge to raise a point, I guess you can look at this two ways. You can either say they are consolidating further to regional facilities or they are taking the outrageous step of saying, we're not going to take the efficiencies of regional facilities any more, we want each county to have their own facility. Again, depending on a structural standpoint, how you look at this, it could be a real step back.

Mr. Hartwick: Safety of the community is important but if you talk to a mental health community as well, they think making the transition within the community is probably the best possible plan for the patients who are currently there.

Mr. Haste: I totally agree with that if there are proper resources to do it.

Mr. Hartwick: That is what we are fighting for.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That's exactly it.

Mr. Haste: I think that everybody's goal is to finally get these folks back into the community. The problem is you have to be committed in doing that and not do it half baked.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm prepared to negotiate.

Ms. Moore: Another concern that we have and will be part of our negotiations, are what resources are needed for family members who currently have very easy access to the Harrisburg State Hospital to visit their family members who are there. But now, as you know will have to travel some distance if they want to continue those relationships. So we are building that into our budget requests for DPW.

Mr. Haste: If a SEPTA passes!

Mr. Hartwick: You're really helping with negotiations here, Jeff.

Mr. Haste: We can play good guy, bad guy. You're the good guy.

Ms. Moore: What current needs are and they are listed. One of the big expansion in our mental health system is to not only be able to address the crisis that these folks will go through but also to address some of the concerns that Commissioner Haste has brought up, is our forensic system. We need a lot of forensic beds to be able to deal with folks instead of going into our prison system or going into those horde state bed hospitals. We have been talking to other counties. We've been talking about doing something regionally with other counties and pulling our resources because for other counties it could be very difficult like Perry County who might only need one bed or two beds a year. It is pretty difficult for them to have those kinds of resources available.

Mr. DiFrancesco: When you talk about forensic, will you clarify to me, what that is?

Ms. Moore: Actually, no, I'll let Dan do that.

Mr. Eisenhower: Basically it is a completely different treatment approach to a person who is a mentally ill offender. Dauphin County has very limited provider network that provides forensic mental services. So we are talking about funding to develop a forensic mental health specialty service. Basically, some counties have sufficient funding and have sufficient providers to perform these services, we don't. It can be a combination of residential programming with specialty programs. It can be a combination of what they call ACTT, Assertive Community Treatment Teams and a variety of specialty drug & alcohol mental offender programs. Bottom line is, we just haven't had sufficient funding to recruit providers to do those services in Dauphin County. We have already mentally carved out a portion of funding to develop that as part of this closure.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Do you see the need in going forward in a plan to have more community based homes, group homes?

Mr. Eisenhower: Yes, the three main types of residential services that we currently fund are long term structure residence, a community residential rehabilitation or group home and specialized personal care homes with our personal care home using extra medical staff. Those remain our three main residential programs that will be part of these conversations for the closure.

Mr. Hartwick: How is that all former legislators or elected officials are now managing these long term care facilities for these patients?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I am wondering if we need to reach out to our local municipalities.

Mr. Haste: That's why I was asking about the 30 day notice.

Mr. Eisenhower: That's the next step that we get to.

Ms. Moore: We are hoping that you could add to the list of next steps.

Obviously, we talked a lot about improving a community based system but we also need some additional support in our County mental health system to be able to handle this. Letting 40+ people out of the state hospital, doing adequate assessments, making sure we get the right people connected to the right source, services and building that infrastructure. It is going to take some staff time. I'm very concerned because this is not the only issue that's happening in our County mental health system. I need to make sure as Human Service Director the rest of County mental health system continues to function. So part of our proposal to DPW will be additional money to hire additional staff to be able to oversee this whole process. We will not do it without that. We cannot do it without it. We've talked about the waiver to use our mental health resource if any of these folks end up in our prison system. We may want to expand that to say that we want to use mental health dollars regardless if these folks who go in or if it is anybody else. I think we are going to push the envelope as far as we can on this.

We also talked a little bit about the public meeting. The public meeting that we plan for January 12<sup>th</sup> was to reach out to our provider system and to consumers of service and family members of people who would be impacted by this. I think it is growing. I think in the end we hopefully will still be able to really give people an opportunity and voice to share with us whatever their concerns are, what their best thinking around solutions might be, what we need to add to our thinking as we go into negotiations with DPW.

Mr. Hartwick: We're going to do some serious planning around a productive two hour session that is going to be very structured and very point related to individuals who are affected by the system, give the providers an opportunity to talk about what resources and what infrastructure they feel is necessary, and family members who maybe affected by this. This in no way is going to turn into a protest and a position for everybody and their brother who wants to come out for other reasons other than what the County is going to be responsible for providing and how we best can receive that feedback. Those individuals, through this meeting, are not going to be afforded the opportunity. This will be a very structured, a very pointed meeting that allows us to have a great exchange from those people affected by the system. We're hearing reports of everybody coming out to this meeting to protest the loss of jobs. Obviously, we don't want this to close. We made that very clear. If they want to protest the loss of jobs, they need to talk to the folks who are making the decisions to close the facility. We have a responsibility to talk about how we need to position Dauphin County in case of closure. We will have a very structured meeting that deals with the specific concerns of the individuals that I mentioned. It is not going to get out of hand.

Ms. Moore: Once we gather information not only from that public meeting but it sounds like some other folks, maybe the Commissioners have some ideas about. Then we

need to fine tune our comprehensive strategy and what we will be asking from DPW in our negotiations. Our next step is to make sure that we get the funding to be able to oversee and provide the support services that we need from DPW. That will happen through our negotiations. Certainly you all will be involved in every step as we go through these negotiations. We will also be talking to other counties about which strategies from that overall comprehensive plan should be done locally and which ones are appropriate and cost effective to do regionally. Again, the bottom line for us is exactly what you have been talking about needing to make sure that there is a lot of advocacy and lots of pressure out there to make sure that we have funding for not only our short term needs but our long range funding needs. I have to tell you, when we first heard about state hospital closure all kinds of fears, worries and concerns went into my head. Some of those were realistic. Some of those probably aren't. There are probably some good solutions to most of them. One thing that I am 150% confident in and that is our mental health staff is capacity to do this, their skill and expertise to make sure that they do comprehensive assessments of the folks who are in there, make sure we know what services they need and that those folks can safely be integrated. People who can not, will not be coming into our community.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In a lot of ways, this Board has had a track record where we do reach out to the Commonwealth and we do sit down and talk with them. We try to be proactive and have solutions. I know there is a lot of concern. I know some of our comments today could be taken as critical to the state. It's not critical as much as it is concern. We want to sit down with them. We want to work with them. We want to do what is best for these individuals who require the services for the families of those individuals and for the taxpayers. We have everybody's priority in mind. I think it is important to say, we want to work with the state to make sure they are being taken care of as best as possible but there are some requirements. We need long term funding commitments. We need short term money to put the infrastructure in place. This Board is committed in doing what we need to do to sit down from an advocacy standpoint, from a negotiation standpoint or whatever the standpoint may be to make this transaction happen in the smoothest way possible. Aside from the actual patients, we do have a very large work force probably a majority of which live in this county. Now they will be looking for new jobs or we're going to have to shift them elsewhere. It is not just sort of the medical aspect. It is the economic aspect. There are a lot of next steps as we sit down. I know you guys are doing a great job dealing with a very crisis situation. The Board is committed to helping out however possible.

Ms. Moore: Are there any other questions?

Mr. Haste: You know how I feel.

## **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Mr. Haste: We have Items A thru E for discussion. We need to vote on Items A & B. Is there a motion to approve Item A?

- A. Exercise the option to renewal an Agreement between Dauphin County and Republic Services of PA LLC d/b/a York Waste Disposal for municipal waste collection, transportation and disposal services.  
**(\*\*\*REQUEST A VOTE 1/05/05)**

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to exercise the option to renew an Agreement between Dauphin County and Republic Services of PA LLC d/b/a York Waste Disposal for municipal waste collection, transportation and disposal services; motion carried.**

- B. Appoint David Transue to the Dauphin County General Authority.  
(Term will expire 1<sup>st</sup> Monday, January, 2010). Term will expire 1<sup>st</sup> Monday, January, 2010.  
**(\*\*\*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 1/05/05)**

Mr. Haste: Is there a vote to approve Item B?

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to appoint David Transue to the Dauphin County General Authority; motion carried.**

- C. Appoint Tom Clark to the Dauphin County Planning Commission.
- D. Agreement between Dauphin County and Conrad Siegel Actuaries to perform an actuarial loss reserve valuation for the Dauphin County
- E. Project Modification request for PCCD Grant - Project Safe Neighborhoods Mini Grant (Subgrant #2003-SD-01-14153 in the amt. of \$10,000).

## **SOLICITOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Haste: Is there a Solicitor's report?

Mr. Saylor: He stepped out.

Mr. DiFrancesco: While he is gone, I would like to ask the Chief Clerk to reach out to the Planning Commission because the gentleman whose resignation I handed in was elected at their last meeting as Treasurer of their organization. I'm assuming word did not get to them yet that he resigned. So if you could reach out to them and we need to appoint someone to replace him.

Mr. Saylor: I will do.

Mr. Haste: If we have any concerns with the Solicitor's report, we will see him directly.

## **REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR**

Mr. Saylor: I have no report.

## **COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS**

Mr. Haste: Are there any comments from the Commissioners? (There was none)

## **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**

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

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk  
January 5, 2005

printed 7/13/05