



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2003 (10:00 A.M.)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Haste
Lowman Henry, Vice Chairman
Anthony Petrucci, Secretary

STAFF PRESENT

Robert Burns, Chief Clerk; Julia Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk; Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; Jim Frandano, Information Technology; Sharon Manton, Director of Personnel; Rick Wynn, Director of Human Services; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facility Maintenance; Jennifer Kocher, Director of Communications; Dan Robinson, Director of Economic Development; Anthony White, Director of Fiscal Affairs; Steve Chiavetta, Director of Registration & Elections; Bob Knupp, Esq.; Jane Gordon, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office; Dan Mosel, Human Services; Gary Serhan, Controller's Office; Faye Fisher, Personnel; Sharon Ludwig, Personnel; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Diane McNaughton, Communications; Dominick DeRose, Warden; Kelly Wolf, Recycling Coordinator; Yvonne Fuhrman, Solid Waste Management; Dan Lispi, Solid Waste ; Cheryl Buchanan, Purchasing; Shari Eagle, Information Technology; Jim Albert, Commissioners' Office; Amanda Chmiola, Commissioners' Office.

GUESTS PRESENT

Sondra Mosten, Tom Helsel, Christine Reily.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Henry: We have a number of versions of Minutes. Commissioner Petrucci, welcome back.

Mr. Petrucci: Thank you. It's good to be back.

Mr. Henry: This is historic. This is the first full meeting of our new Board of Commissioners. It is an exciting day for us. Commissioner, we have been holding a number of Minutes pending your return, in view of the fact that Commissioner Haste was not on the Board from the period November 14th through December 17, 2002. So if you don't have an objection you and I could approve these today or we could carry them forward if you feel it necessary to do that.

Mr. Petrucci: I make a motion that we approve the Minutes.

Mr. Henry: We have a motion to approve the Minutes listed on the Agenda. I'll second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Petrucci: Aye.

Mr. Henry: Aye. Thank you, Commissioner.

ELECTION BOARD

The Election Board Minutes are on file in the Commissioners' Office.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Henry: Do we have Public participation for any item on the Agenda today? Seeing none we will move on.

PERSONNEL

Mr. Henry: Personnel. Faye.

Ms. Fisher: Good morning, Commissioners. We have several Salary Board request items. The first is for Dauphin Manor, which is to abolish an Assistant Administrator position and create an Administrator position. Second and third transactions are for Children & Youth and both are to create a Case Worker I or II or Social Worker I position.

Mr. Haste: Can I ask why we don't know the position?

Ms. Fisher: I think the State decides what type of position.

Mr. Wynn: One, when they have the list sometimes there is not someone on the list. It really depends on the qualifications of the person that they hire whether or not they come in as a I or a II. I think it also ties in with the union agreement. I thought that is how they usually request those all the time.

Ms. Fisher: It is.

Mr. Haste: Whether it is a I or a II will come in at a different rate, correct? So the rate on there might not be the accurate rate?

Mr. Wynn: I don't have that in front of me so I don't know. You may be correct on that. That may have to change depending on which.

Ms. Fisher: I think they listed the hourly rate for the I.

Mr. Henry: So the rate listed would be the highest rate that we would anticipate? It could range lower?

Mr. Haste: No it's the other way around.

Mr. Henry: This is the lower rate and it could go up.

Ms. Fisher: I think that is the way that they completed the form. If you would like I can get the additional information before the next meeting.

Mr. Henry: Please.

Ms. Fisher: Sure. Any other questions?

Mr. Henry: And these positions were budgeted for.

Mr. Haste: Yes, I saw that.

Ms. Fisher: The next transaction is also for Children & Youth and it is to abolish a Case Work Supervisor and create a Case Work Manager I position. And then the last transaction is for Human Services. It is to create an Administrative Officer position. I

was told before the meeting that the effective date should now be January 2nd for this position rather than February 3rd.

Mr. Henry: And we would be eliminating a consultant expenses as a result of that.

Ms. Fisher: That is correct.

Mr. Haste: I know this request was made so I will speak on behalf of Marie, and Marie correct me if I'm wrong, you are looking for a job description, is that correct?

Ms. Rebuck: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Do we have that?

Mr. Wynn: I thought that was part of the justification.

Ms. Fisher: Ok. Then it should be in my office.

Mr. Haste: Make sure Marie has the job description.

Ms. Fisher: Sure. That concludes the Salary Board packet.

Mr. Petrucci: I have some questions in regard to that. The Administrator position for the Manor, I see that we are going to not have a consultant do the management there but are now going to undertake the management of the Manor on our own. I have no problem with that but I would request that we get to see as a Board the person that will be asked to fill that spot.

Secondly in regard to the new position being created in Human Services for Mr. Wynn. I am supporting that with the understanding that the work that is being done mainly by this position will be to try and get Children & Youth Services provided in Dauphin County. That there is an effort underway to try and do some of our own work with our own children in Dauphin County and that would be part of the special task assigned to this function. Thank you.

Mr. Henry: Commissioner, to provide some background and information on both of your comments. On the Administrator position at Dauphin Manor, you may recall, for Commissioner Haste who was not here during that period of time, a year and a half ago we hired Qunique Corporation to provide some clinical services for us to help us prepare for our DOH surveys. They also ultimately provided us with an administrator when the situation involving Mr. Waxler was resolved. Mr. Young and Qunique have provided that on a consulting basis and will continue to do so through I believe the sixth of February. As with our consultants, my view is, we have them in for a period of time to do what needs to be done and then consultants go away and regular staff takes over. It is now my belief that we are at Dauphin Manor, in a position where Cindy Melamed, who has been our Assistant Administrator out there for the past two years. When Mr.

Waxler left, Cindy had only been here for a week or two and was not prepared to take over. Cindy, working with Steve Tessier and John Long, has formed a very strong administrative team at Dauphin Manor. I think that we have nurtured and brought along our management team and they are now ready to run the facility on their own. We eliminated the Administrator position when we went to having a consultant do it so it was not on the books. Hence the reason to recreate it. So we will now be going back to the model of an administrator and one assistant administrator instead of a consultant and two assistant administrators. This will result in lower costs. I think it is a home grown team and it is going to have a very positive effect on morale at Dauphin Manor along with our new structure which will be opening later this spring. So many exciting things are happening there.

I'm also pleased to report that the Department of Health showed up Sunday morning about 8:00 to complete the annual survey activities and at the end of the day Cindy gave me a call and I am pleased to report that Dauphin Manor has completely passed the annual inspection. We have new tags and the facility is in complete compliance. So I think congratulations are in order to everybody, particularly all those who came in Sunday to deal with the Department of Health. Apparently they like Sunday mornings as a time to come in and do their inspections rather than regular weekdays. But they did not catch our crew off guard and they did an excellent job. So I will ask Cindy to please make an appointment to see you and also Commissioner Haste if he would like, if he hasn't met her between now and next Tuesday.

On the issue of Human Services, I believe that as we went through the Schaffner Youth Detention Center discussions a year ago, one of the main outcomes of that was the fact that it really came to the community's attention that our juveniles do not have facilities in Dauphin County where once they have moved through the legal process and need to enter into their treatment regiment there is no place in Dauphin County for them to do that. Many people believe that Schaffner Youth Detention Center was the facility where juveniles spend an extended period of time after they were adjudicated. In fact Schaffner is a short stay facility for juveniles to stay until their adjudication. Which brought the issue up as to why there were not these facilities in Dauphin County. Since these treatment facilities are for the most part if not all non-profit, it became necessary for us to incubate or encourage these types of facilities in Dauphin County. One way to do that, the one thing we are blessed with, is an abundance of property out around Schaffner. And that becomes an issue for locating facilities of these sorts because you get into a sort of a NIMBY type of situation when you try to locate them in a populated area. But we have an area that is somewhat isolated that is ideal. That is an area that Rick and Danny are working on. It is going to be a long term project because we have to identify what we want to do, develop a master plan, and provide them with enough of an incentive to want to provide those facilities in Dauphin County. Out of the very difficult Schaffner situation I think has come something very positive and in fact that will be the focal point of this position and our department over the coming few years. Your leadership and support on that have been very much appreciated.

Mr. Haste: Commissioner, I have a clean up question. The contract for the consulting services at the Manor, has that already been terminated or do we need to take action to terminate that or will it?

Mr. Henry: We terminated it in early December and there was a sixty day notification period. Apparently on or about December 6th. It was terminated but the effective date was sixty days hence. Which has worked out well because we had the Department of Health survey that Qunique had been involved in helping us work with and I felt they should stay through that process. It has now been successfully completed. Plus we are also in the process of doing a search for a Director of Nursing and as with all such facilities we have a shortage of nurses. We are working aggressively to try and correct that but it is a tough situation. Do we have additional questions relative to Salary Board? Marie, do you have any? Ok.

Ms. Fisher: The rest of the Personnel packet is pretty routine. I can go through it if you like me to. If there are any questions I can try to address them.

Mr. Petrucci: Yes, what is, I see about 13 people from Drug & Alcohol are considered furloughed. About four were considered resignations. What is a furlough? Have we not privatized that group? So a furlough indicates what? That they are laid off but could come back?

(Comment by someone in the audience that was not audible on the tape.)

Mr. Henry: We took an action in November or December to abolish those positions. Why is this coming back before us now?

Ms. Fisher: After payroll removes people from the listing we just list them on the Changes Listing.

Mr. Henry: So it is an administrative function?

Ms. Fisher: Right. They are just put in the packet as a FYI. On the New Hire Listing number eight I would just like to change the effective date to be in line with the Salary Board action item. So I would like to change that from February 3rd to January 2nd.

Mr. Henry: Gentlemen, any questions?

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Petrucci: No.

Mr. Henry: Thank you, Faye. We will carry this over to next week's Legislative Session.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Henry: Training packet, Mr. Burns.

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, there are thirteen items in the packet and they can all be carried over to next week. They have all been pre-approved.

Mr. Henry: Commissioners, any questions or comments?

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Petrucci: No.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Henry: Mr. Baratucci, purchase orders.

Mr. Baratucci: Commissioners, you should have all received your packet yesterday. At this point there are no additions to it. There are a number of budget issues as I discussed last week that Mike and I have already discussed. I am making some calls and he is making some adjustments and by the time it comes to you next week they will all be resolved one way or another. If you have any questions on any of the items in here I will be happy to answer them. Otherwise we will resolve all those issues and forward a clean packet to you next week.

Mr. Henry: Any questions? Thank you, Randy.

DIRECTORS

Mr. Henry: Under directors reports, we have a number of items today. We will begin with our Chief of Staff, Mr. Burns.

- A. Robert Burns, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff
 - 1. Status of Administration and Courthouse renovations.

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, today is the day you had asked me to provide a report to you on the status of the renovations to the Administration Building and the Courthouse, as well as the costs involved. I do have a report to give to you that will take about five minutes so if you have questions or comments please feel free to interrupt me.

In May of 2000, the County initiated the first of two \$15 million borrowings from the Emmaus bond pool to purchase and renovate the former Mellon Bank building and renovate the Courthouse. In addition, \$1 million remained from a 1998 bond issue and was available for use on this project. Combined \$31 million is available for this project.

Questions have been raised about the status of the renovations to the courthouse, the amount of money spent on the renovations to the administration building and the projected final cost of this project. At the direction of the Commissioners, I have endeavored to answer these questions.

The Budget Director provided all of the figures I have used for purposes of this analysis. It is apparent to me that the most effective way to answer all questions is to open all records and make all information available to all of the citizens of Dauphin County. In that spirit, we have available today an itemized listing of every bill which has been paid to date on either the administration building or the courthouse and estimates of future costs.

Over the past two years several different figures have been given for the cost of the administration building renovations. I can report the accurate figure is \$12,253,062.68. This figure includes every bill which was charged to the administration building except for one. The purchase price of the administration building (\$5,466,961.99) is not included in this figure. With respect to the Courthouse renovations, as of today, we have identified expenses totaling \$12,138,436.19. In comparing the cost of renovations for the two facilities, we can see that the costs to renovate the two facilities are almost equal.

When the purchase price of the administration building is added to the renovations cost, the total amount which is charged to the administration building is \$17,720,024.67.

In an effort to determine if there have been cost overruns on the renovations to the administration building we find that the county requested bids for six separate contracts relating to the renovations of the administration building. These six contracts were for Phase One demolition, Phase Two demolition, elevators, steam service, purchase of HVAC equipment and the main renovations including plumbing, HVAC and electrical work. We have available today for review the letters which were sent in 2000 awarding the contracts complete with the amount of each contract.

These six contracts totaled \$8,390,783. In addition a contingency fund was established at \$475,000. The contracted amount plus the contingency fund represents the construction budget for the administration building. This figure is \$8,865,783.

The total amount spent on the renovations of the administration building was \$8,048,818.60. When the bills of the construction manager (\$590,708.55) are added, the total cost of construction for the administration building equals \$8,639,527.10. This figure is \$226,255.90 less than the contracted amount and the contingency fund.

Of the six contracts in question only one was not completed within the amount contracted. Change orders were needed for the Phase Two demolition work. These change orders were paid for from the money set aside in the contingency fund.

To summarize, the construction work at the administration building was completed within the budget. With one exception, each individual contract was completed within the amount contracted for. This one exception was covered by the contingency fund.

It is also important to point out that significant expenditures were charged to the administration building but are in fact shared benefits for many, if not all, departments and facilities throughout county government. For example, the \$31 million bond money has paid for a new telephone system which is now in place in all county offices including offices outside of the downtown complex such as the Prison, Adult Probation and Dauphin Manor. Similarly, new computers were purchased or leased out of the bond proceeds and these computers are being used throughout county government. Finally a large portion of security costs was apportioned to the administration building. These costs include security enhancements for the entire downtown complex.

With respect to the courthouse renovations, as of today, approximately \$8 million is available to complete the renovations. It will take that entire amount to successfully complete the project. In a report dated January 2, our budget director estimated that we could face a deficit of about \$395,000 if all contracts and all contingency funds are exhausted. There is a contingency fund which has been set aside which contains \$350,000. In other words, we are on a very tight budget and we need to very carefully manage the remainder of this project.

It should be noted that as the courthouse renovations have progressed certain changes to the original scope have occurred. For example, the Sheriff's department is now under renovation. This represents a cost of approximately \$200,000 which was not part of the original plan for this phase of the renovations. Similarly, the former Commissioners Hearing Room on the second floor of the courthouse was not included in the original plans for this phase of renovations. It is now being included in Phase One. Finally, the Facilities Maintenance department was located in the basement of the administration building as an addition to the original Phase One plans. Each of these additions has had an impact on the cost of Phase One.

I have met individually with all three commissioners and each of you has given clear direction that you are firmly committed to seeing this project completed within the budgeted amount of \$31 million. You have directed the construction team to identify all areas of the project which could be completed more cost effectively. Additionally, we are taking steps to perform increased duties in-house, such as using our Facilities Maintenance department to move departments. These measures will lower our remaining costs.

Finally you have received a list of suggested areas in which our expenses on this project can be reduced. The items on this list total approximately \$1 million. Furthermore, on today's agenda, under Items For Discussion, there are two Change Orders being presented. These change orders for work which would constitute additions to Phase One of the project. These two change orders total in excess of \$420,000. It is

my belief that the Board is prepared to act today to formally reject these change orders. You will recall that these change orders were part of a plan to move the entrance of the Courthouse to Front Street and to develop a walkway between the administration building and the Courthouse. By rejecting these proposed change orders the Board will take a major step towards ensuring that this project is completed within the budget.

As the project moves towards its expected completion of January 2004, all phases of the project will be presented to the Board of Commissioners on a regular basis so that you can remain abreast of the cost and the status. We are establishing weekly meetings of the construction team and our budget director so that we can track costs. Change orders will not be acted upon until the Board has an opportunity to review the requested changes.

It is our belief that a system is now in place which will allow this project to be completed on time and within the original budget.

That is my report Commissioners. I will be happy to try to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Henry: Gentlemen.

Mr. Haste: Bob, first off I want to thank you for stepping forward and taking charge on this one and becoming the point person. I think from this point forward, hopefully you are involved in this project from every part of it along with Edgar so that we do keep control of this project. One of my concerns in looking at it, there was really no one in charge of this project and keeping tabs on it. Different phases, different people were looking at it and doing different things. The first thing that we had to do was have someone in charge and responsible for the project.

I looked at the list of suggestions and where we can save some money. One question I have, I know it happened before I got here but I am aware of some other change orders and some other items that are being held by Mr. Yohe. How do those factor into this? Are we suggesting we don't pay those? We are going to pay those? We are going to look at them? How does that factor into this scenario?

Mr. Burns: I think, Commissioner, there are a couple of change orders that have never actually made it onto an Agenda. That is why we did not put them on today's Agenda. We could certainly do that at the direction of the Board. I think in addition to the \$420,000 change orders that are on today, there is approximately another \$600,000 that have been presented but never actually made it onto an Agenda. Those would represent costs in addition to what has already been identified.

Mr. Haste: So we would need to reject those as well?

Mr. Burns: We could do that, Commissioner, certainly.

Mr. Henry: It's not work already performed?

Mr. Burns: No, the work has not been performed. It has simply been proposed to be included in Phase I as an addition to Phase I but it has never been formerly been presented to the Board for action.

Mr. Haste: OK. It is my understanding in going through this, Bill (Tully), did you get the folder that I gave you this morning?

(Comment not audible)

Mr. Haste: Ok. I went over to the Controller's Office, as far as I know, there are two existing contracts, is that correct?

Mr. Burns: Yes.

Mr. Haste: With Buchart/Horn.

Mr. Burns: Yes, Commissioner.

Mr. Haste: The rest of them have been closed so we are really only dealing with two open contracts at this point in time?

Mr. Burns: That is my understanding as well.

Mr. Haste: One of the things that I think we need to take a look at, just in looking at those two contracts, and I am basically directing this at Bill more than anybody, but Bob, I am asking that you take a look too. There appears to be rates that we have been billed for that don't completely follow the schedule that is attached to the one contract. I just like to see an explanation on how they came up with those rates. I know in reviewing what has been billed to date, I hope we take a closer look at those bills. I think there is some room for negotiation in some of them. When I saw some of them, I know if I would be reviewing those, I would have concerns with them. So I hope that you take a real hard look at whatever bills we get from this point forward. I would also suggest that, giving that we are taking the steps that we have, whatever the appropriate time is, whether we do it today or we do it next week, we begin the process of scaling back their activity so that they are doing engineering services and only engineering services or architectural services, I think most of those are done, and they do not continue to do work that we have capable County employees that can do the work for much cheaper cost. One of those I think is, under your management, that we get a more efficient management system.

Mr. Burns: Thank you, Commissioner. I will follow that direction.

Mr. Petrucci: Mr. Chairman, if I might also make a comment in regard to this. Above and beyond just approving or disapproving change orders is a concern about what has

been the extent of our construction requests in Phase I and Phase II and what the scope of Phase I is and the scope of Phase II. I'm not so sure that the scope of those things hasn't changed from the time that the Commissioners originally contemplated the work that was being done. So I would like a review of exactly what it is that we are doing with the money that we have approved and see if there aren't potential changes that could even reduce the size of that if some things have crept in that shouldn't have crept in. So how we go about doing that, I'm not sure. I as one Commissioner would like to see what exactly is the scope of Phase I and the scope of Phase II so that I know what is being contemplated with the money that we have allocated.

Mr. Burns: Commissioner, I had asked Whiting/Turner, the construction manager to be prepared at the next Workshop to give an update on the status of the renovations and what has been done and what is still outstanding. We can ask them to define the scope and how it has changed.

Mr. Henry: if I could build upon Commissioner Petrucci's comment, I would also be interested in knowing, are there activities that Phase I has created that now are going to have to be completed in Phase II? Have we taken steps toward something that we are now going to be obligated to complete, otherwise we've rendered a portion of the building useless or some system in the building functioning improperly and obligated ourselves to a Phase II project that we really have to take a look at the scope on. I have heard over the last couple of years various cost estimates for Phase II that have ranged anywhere from \$15-\$30 million. Now that is a range that concerns me greatly. I am further concerned that have we done certain functions that now are going to obligate us to do additional things that are not part of Phase I and are not funded. So if Whiting/Turner could address that issue and we can get some ideas to what is going to still have to be done going forward so that we can do some long range budget planning as well. Because there are other pressing needs upon the County beside renovations and I will note the overcrowding at the Prison and the need for rebuilding our Emergency Communications System that are going to be competing for dollars.

Mr. Petrucci: Along the same topic, Commissioners, I would like to bring to your attention the Minutes of the General Authority of December 18th. We are also undergoing some renovations in the Human Service Building. That renovation project evidently, has been under the oversight of a former Commissioner who has signed off on much of the contracts and directions of that building. The General Authority has language in their Minutes here that they are concerned about that and that their name is largely just as a pass through. The direction of the costs and decisions had been under the direction of the Commissioner. Their concern is that they are going to be now forced to accept cost over runs when they really didn't have any of the decision making processes in regard to that. So above and beyond the Courthouse and the Administration Building there also appears to be renovations in the Human Service building that we would need to investigate in regard to who is in charge, what is the status of that particular expenditure and project as well.

Mr. Henry: The General Authority has on a number of occasions expressed those concerns. As a matter of fact I have on several occasions sent letters to the General Authority Board asking that certain projects or certain phases of the project not be done because of cost considerations. That became over ridden in the long run. I think there is a real concern there. One of the things that we did do three years ago was to move offices around to maximize our flow of Federal and State rental dollars and it has put, I believe, or did, both the Human Services Building and 100 Chestnut into a relatively self sustaining situation. My concern is that the renovations to the Human Services Building may take us back out of that situation which is not where we want to be. So perhaps some discussions with Mr. Hawk to get a grip on that situation would be in order as well.

Mr. Haste: One other comment. As Commissioner Petrucci was talking I thought of something else. I understand what he was saying about it appeared that some of this work was being directed by a Commissioner not by the Board of Commissioners. I would just like to go on record saying that if in fact that happened and Buchart/Horn or Whiting/Turner or someone else submitted bills and work was being done at the direction of one, they are somewhat, they are not clean in this effort either. They fully understand and should understand having done work in this Commonwealth and doing work with municipalities and County governments that work can not be done and can not be authorized by an individual. So they have to bear some responsibility in this. I would suggest that if in fact that occurred and there are bills that were paid or work done without the direction of the Board of Commissioners which is the only proper way to do it, that we ought to have a discussion with them about them anteing up in this process as well. They know, anyone who does business and I came from that other side, anyone who does business with public entities know and if they don't, that's not true, they know that it requires action of the Board. If they did something without complete authorization by the Board, they know that's not right.

Mr. Henry: I think what has more happened is that we have periodically been presented with change orders for work that has already been done, leaving us with little choice but to approve the change orders. That has been somewhat of a standard operating procedure over the past few years. I would concur that, much like the two change orders, that hopefully the Board will reject today, they come before us before the work is done and we actually have some decision making ability over it.

Mr. Haste: They also know that is the procedure.

Mr. Henry: I will point out that the two change orders coming before us I have voted against at least twice as they have come before us. It seems to be like a bad penny that keeps turning up and hopefully we will bury this once and for all today. Any further questions for Mr. Burns?

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Petrucci: I do. There is an issue on the Agenda, item I, for the creation of a Courthouse Renovation Oversight Committee that I had suggested. I am wanting to get

comfortable that everyone who should have some input into the nature of what it is that we are doing has some input into that. The Board of Commissioners by ourselves are the ultimate decision makers but there needs to be sufficient input from people impacted such as the Court, the President Judge and I'm not sure how that occurs. I see that the Court Administrator is here and perhaps could speak at hearings that we have where the project unfolds. If that is thought to be sufficient that we have regular hearings here on this project so that input could be had by the President Judge and others who would, such as our financial advisors, then that would be fine and there won't be a need to set up a particular committee that included all of them. If that is going to be the case, that we have a regular hearing at Workshop covering the renovations so that we get a report every two weeks about where we are going and how we are going and that everyone has the right to have input at those hearings, then I see no need to have item I, a special creation of a committee unless the Board feels that is a better way to go.

Mr. Haste: Your intent was to have everything in a public setting and I think as long as Mr. Burns is going to be making those reports and we have discussion at the Workshop and when we have those discussions we need to make sure that the President Judge and everybody else is aware of it. I think this is as good a setting as any where.

Mr. Burns: Perhaps we can just make it a regular Agenda item on Workshop.

Mr. Haste: Ok.

Mr. Petrucci: I think for the next several months that would be an excellent thing to do. Therefore I will pull item I off of the Agenda action items.

Mr. Henry: Anything else?

Mr. Petrucci: Mr. Chairman, may I go back to, as we are under directors, to Mr. Rick Wynn and put him on the spot here. I was looking over the overtime report that came in the Personnel packet. I noticed that MH/MR had a budget of \$26,000 for overtime and in the first 10 days of this year they have used 50% of that money. What happened in the first 10 days that they have used 50% of their overtime money?

Mr. Wynn: I would have to get back to you on that one. I will by the next meeting. I would assume it had something to do with holiday coverage for the Crisis workers but I'm not sure of that.

Mr. Petrucci: Will you check into that and see what the hell happened?

Mr. Yohe: Anthony, if I can answer that one. MH/MR runs on a fiscal year. That is July one until the present.

Mr. Henry: That's true.

Mr. Petrucci: It says year to date but that means fiscal year to date not calendar year to date.

Mr. Henry: They are right on track then. 50% used halfway through the year.

Mr. Petrucci: All the others are saying like 100% used and 90% used so I was wondering why theirs was down to 50%. It says fiscal department percent of year remaining is 98% remaining.

Mr. Yohe: The accounting system that we have does not recognize a fiscal year.

Mr. Petrucci: So I'm reading this right it's just this damn computer isn't printing it.

Mr. Henry: We will move to Mr. Yohe. Mike you have a cash flow report and proposal to discuss.

B. Mike Yohe, Budget Director

1. Cash Flow Report.
2. Proposal to Refinance Debt.

Mr. Yohe: Commissioners, at last week's meeting Commissioner Haste asked me to look into not only the whole budget situation but more importantly a cash flow report as it relates to the County as a whole not just the General Fund. Let me, I'll back up just a little bit to explain how the system works. The General Fund, obviously, runs on a calendar year basis. That is where all the tax monies flow into. The General Fund has to support all the other twenty eight County funds if necessary. What I did to put this analysis together, there are certain funds, operating funds, that are primarily funded by the State. However they are funded on a reimbursement basis. In other words, we front the money, at the end of every quarter we get reimbursed. I looked at all those funds in that situation and picked out the three besides the General Fund that contain a quite of few payroll positions or salary positions, they being Dauphin Manor, Children & Youth and Domestic Relations. Historically those are the three funds that run into cash flow problems on an ongoing basis. That is wholly contingent on the State reimbursement. When the State is operating well, our reimbursements are timely, we get them quick. We don't have to front the money very long. I have seen that process slowing down a little bit over the course of this past year.

So what I did was take the four funds, General Fund, Domestic Relations, Dauphin Manor and Children & Youth, I have record in my office on a daily basis cash balances in each of those funds. I took last year's, I gave each of you a copy of that report, if we apply last year's rates of cash inflows and outflows for lack of a better term, and apply it to our beginning balance this year the report indicated that we could have a problem toward the end of the year on a cash basis. Now if we could take those other three funds out of the equation which is what we focus on during the budget process,

we wouldn't have that problem right now. But as the report shows, when all four are taken into account together, we could run into some cash flow problems at the end of the year. I laid it all out. If you have any questions about the report, again, I want to reiterate that this is strictly using 2002's rates. I am applying them to the beginning balance as we started this year. I don't have any indication as to why that would vary substantially but obviously there is a chance that some reimbursements could come in this year on a different pay than last year but I can't predict that.

Mr. Henry: So the flow problem is from the State reimbursement funds not from the County's cash flow point of view per say.

Mr. Yohe: Per say. At the end of the year, based on our advances to the various funds, at the end of every year we clean up each of those funds. Say Children & Youth is \$3 million in the hole at December 31. the General Fund will transfer \$3 million over to that fund to bring it back to zero. Those balances at the end of each year, at the end of this year, were substantially higher than they were at the end of 2001. I can only relate that to the fact that we just didn't get the reimbursements at the same pace as we had gotten it before. I know Children & Youth as of December 31 would owe Dauphin County General Fund about \$4 million. Dauphin Manor owes a little bit over \$3 million. This is over and above our budgeted transfer.

Mr. Henry: So that money would come in from Federal and State sources sometime early this year which would then be applied back to it and replenish our funding.

Mr. Yohe: Exactly. Unfortunately we don't have at the end of the year, we have to account for that. We have to be solvent at the end of the year. Based on that report I laid it out and those are the assumptions I took. To be quite honest this is solely prepared by myself. No input from anybody else but I haven't had any direction as to any better way to do it. In my opinion this is the best way to look at the other cash position right now. Our cash balance at the end of 2001, in those four funds, was \$14 million. At the end of 2002 it was \$5.8 million.

Mr. Henry: Has that slowed down because of the State's budget deficit position? Do they hold longer because their revenue flows aren't there?

Mr. Yohe: Without getting a deep study I think that is part of the problem. There may have been some issues that I'm not aware of maybe on our end and maybe we were spending more money than we should have. That I can't say. I don't know. Yes, I think there are some. I noticed a couple reimbursements that we got in this year that we got in last year, we have not gotten in as of the 31st this year. Irregardless we are in a situation here where we need to take steps to correct that. I'll be happy to answer any questions you have about the cash flow report. If there is anything that is not clear on it. Our focus throughout the year, or through the budget process is on the General Fund. Everybody has talked about the \$24,000-\$25,000 balance that is on the report. That is simple an audit. The auditor would come in and take a count that Children & Youth

owes us \$4 million, Dauphin Manor owes us \$3 million. That doesn't help our cash situation.

Mr. Haste: I see item 2, we are going to talk about a way to address part of that but before we do I understand what you are saying and I think so that everybody else understands, one of the difficulties that we have in County government is we are booked on a modified accrual basis. This means that receivables are booked to that calendar year but when we actually operate we are operating on cash in the bank. I think for those who have tried to confuse the issue, they are two separate issues. The budget is done on an accrual basis. What we have to operate on is a cash basis.

When we looked at this, what gives me some concern is just that, on the cash side. I think the Board did what they could do last year to make sure that there was a balanced budget, to make sure that the tax payers did not have a tax increase this year. But in doing that and with the situation that the State has, and Commissioner, I think this is a good scenario. If we are going to see any indication I think we are going to see it possible get worse. If the State's budget, I heard the Governor this morning talking about the deficit they have. Historically having been here and knowing for the short time I was in the Legislature I know what happens when State budgets get tight. They find someone else to push it to and the person they are going to push it to is us.

So I have grave concern, even though we are at the beginning of the year and we have a balanced budget, I have a grave concern with our cash flow situation to make sure that we take into account and we start to address that now. So we don't end up in a bad situation at the end of the year. I know if we don't, I know we are going to have problems. So I think we ought to start looking at this. There are other areas I think we have to begin to look at. I think we need to take a hard look at County government and see where we can make cuts.

This just popped into my mind but one of the things, I know we get, for lack of a better term, suckered into, I know when we are sitting here we are told that it is a position that we need to fill, we don't need to worry about it because it is State or Federally funded and therefore it doesn't adversely affect the General Fund. Maybe it doesn't adversely affect the budget but it does adversely affect the cash flow. And so I guess I'm giving this a warning to Mr. Wynn and anybody else who comes in here and says, it's ok because it is funded by the State or the Federal government. Most of the times it is ok but when we are having to take a close look at cash flow it isn't just ok. It better be a position that we definitely need. Quite frankly if someone is going to say in here that it is going to be funded by the State, the next question ought to be is it going to be funded timely by the State. Because if it's not it adversely affects our cash flow. I think from this point forward this year, we have to take a very strong look at that. I think, we like to look to the State for help, I think this year given the financial situation they are in, and we may not be looking for help. I know how the Legislature reacts and we are going to have a difficult situation because we have a Governor of one party and a Legislature of another. There is going to be a tough battle. When that happens the ones who usually suffer are the ones who trickle down from them and it is us in local

governments. So I think the situation is only going to get worse and not get better. I think we need to take this seriously and take a hard look at it now. I'm saying that, I want to make it very clear. I'm not being critical in any way, shape or form of the budget because it is a balanced budget. I am being very critical of our need to manage this budget closely and watch the cash flow.

Mr. Henry: There is a further issue relative to State and Federal dollars, which is my belief that we ought to be as frugal with those because the same tax payers pay taxes to the County, to the State and to the Federal government. So just because it is Federal or State money doesn't mean it's free money. It is still tax payer money.

Do you have anything more on the cash flow report or do you want to go into your proposal?

Mr. Yohe: I don't have anymore. I just want to emphasize that there is no indication that the State is not paying their money. We are getting reimbursed what we are owed.

Mr. Henry: It has to do with a calendar function relative to when the payments arrive.

Mr. Yohe: Yes.

Mr. Haste: How are we with over matches? We've gotten those? Because that also greatly affects this cash flow problem.

Mr. Wynn: It is my understanding that we virtually eliminated the over match or at least it is very close to it.

Mr. Yohe: Over match hasn't been.

Mr. Haste: That is something that we need to watch this year.

Mr. Yohe: Exactly. In good years with the State the over match goes away. In bad years that creeps back in.

Mr. Haste: I think that is something that we have to watch very closely from this point forward.

Mr. Yohe: That's all I have on the cash flow report. I want to emphasize that I prepared this. I welcome anybody else to take a look at it. I am simply applying last year's rates. If the same thing happens this year we need to take some steps.

My one recommendation, we had talked about this back in October. It is the one area that there is an immediate relief provided. I would not recommend it on a business stand point because it is a cost for us to do this. A debt restructuring like we did in 2000 and 2001 would provide immediate \$4.3 million of not only budget relief which would help. This goes back to the \$24,000 balance. The \$24,000 we are cutting that real

close as to if interest rates rise a little bit, people aren't refinancing again. Phil, I'll pick on Phil, he only gives us \$900,000 instead of \$1.2 million that could go away. As far as a balance goes this would insure that our audit would be clean for 2003. The actual debt expense would be reduced by about \$4.3 million. And it would provide us with \$4.3 million cash relief also, to address the situation that you are in. We have done the \$10 million line of credit. We have no problems at the beginning of the year. I anticipate that, one good point of the cash flow, we may have to tap that very little this year, if the cash comes in the way it came in last year. I think we will still have to tap it but not to the tune of \$10 million.

Mr. Haste: And the line of credit helps us at the beginning of the year. It offers very little relief at the end of the year where cash flow becomes the issue.

Mr. Yohe: This is a non-revolving line of credit. Once we take it, our plan was to pay it back as soon as possible to avoid interest charges but if we draw \$3 million down and we give \$3 million back you only have \$7 million to use for the rest of the year. We can't go back and take the whole thing. Bottom line, December 31 we have to pay it back and that needs cash to pay it back.

Mr. Haste: November and December is where we hit the crunch as far as cash flow goes.

Mr. Yohe: Like I say, I can only bring that to the table as an option. I think in this case it is a critical option. I think we should move forward with that. We already lost a February 1st debt payment that we are not going to be able to capture. If we don't move fairly soon we could lose a March 1st. If we miss March 15th then we have lost more than half of the relief. That's when the big payments will hit. I can address that further with a timeline and everything but the bottom line, I only talked to Lou Verdelli of PFM since they were in charge of the last two. He would need basically verbal approval today to move forward which would just simply be a phone call from myself that we would be moving forward. It needs to close by February 28th in order for us, obviously to pick off the March 1st is about \$350,000. If we move immediately.

Mr. Haste: Which means it needs to be at the State no later than February 8th. DCD requires a twenty day review period.

Mr. Yohe: February 4th he would come to the table here and present the interest rates and everything. There is a twenty day approval period that would be required. Bottom line if we want to get the full effect of this relief we'd have to move very quickly.

Mr. Henry: Except it's not really relief, Mike. All you are doing is pushing payments and obligations forward onto future tax payers.

Mr. Yohe: It is not business wise. I would never suggest this. There is a cost about \$160,000 to do this. And that is because the market is so much lower than what it was back in 2000-2001.

Mr. Henry: Would we be financing debt from a higher interest rate to a lower interest rate or is it going to be a lateral move?

Mr. Yohe: I believe it would be pretty much a lateral move.

Mr. Henry: If it is a lateral move it could actually end up costing us more in the long run because now you are going to be moving your debt payments out farther in terms of time which means you are going to accrue more interest. So it could cost us money to do this. Previous refinancing we have saved money by going from a much higher interest rate to a much lower interest rate which was a prudent move because we saved significant dollars on interest. This move could actually cost us more dollars on interest. Which to me is not a prudent way to proceed.

Mr. Yohe: Yes. Let's back up a little bit. A typical refinancing, you save money. What we did in 2000-2001 did not save us any money. In fact the first one cost us on a present value basis about \$400,000 and the second one cost us about \$260,000.

Mr. Henry: In terms of the cost of doing the issuance?

Mr. Yohe: No that is an additional cost. They did not save the County money. They moved debt back. We are simply proposing to do the same thing. This will be the cheapest of the three.

Mr. Henry: Well at the time it was reported by Mr. Verdelli that it would save us money.

Mr. Yohe: It would provide relief.

Mr. Henry: Not relief. We were refinancing from a higher interest rate to a lower interest rate and I can remember Commissioner Petrucci asking that question at each of our refinancing will this give us a lower interest rate and save us money and the answer was always yes. So I do not see the value in doing a refinancing now that is going to cost us more money. That doesn't appear to make any financial sense whatsoever.

Mr. Haste: If we do not, what do you do come October-November when we don't have any money? Because that is really what we are talking about.

Mr. Henry: I think there are other options that can be explored. One option which was brought to my attention yesterday, the reason why we have this cash flow problem although it is ultimately created because of the State's lagging time schedule for reimbursements, we did have a higher reserve balance until we got whacked with our pension fund contributions which now total over \$7 million for this year. If we are going to look at a relief option, since that is what created the problem, the bad market forces have created the situation by causing us to have to expend that \$7 million by the end of this year, that some sort of financing options involving that payment would be more prudent than a refinancing of existing debt which would be one, costly in terms of

bringing about the refinancing and costly in terms of interest rates. So what we ought to do is look for a way to better handle the unexpected \$7.4 million or whatever it was, cost to the pension fund as opposed to going into areas that have really not been a part of that equation. As a matter of fact you might be able to take advantage of the same market influences that caused that problem to exist to help bale us out of it in terms of the low interest rates that we have now. So I would be more inclined to look at a financing of that payment as opposed to going back into the County's general debt obligations.

Mr. Haste: That payment is how much, in December right now? The retirement.

Mr. Yohe: It is budgeted at \$7.2 million. The bulk of that would be in these four funds that we are looking at here.

Mr. Haste: And even if we refinance that we still have those financing costs which are the same argument that we have on this issue. Those costs don't go away it is just where you give them credit to. That's, let's assume that Mike's number of \$6.5 million short in cash is correct, the \$7 million will cover it. What if in fact we started out the year and our beginning balance which isn't completely figured out yet what if it is lower than we anticipated. And what if the State delays its payments even more and that gets worse than the \$6.5 million. That retirement refinancing is at the end of the year which we don't have much room at all.

Mr. Henry: You are projecting \$6.5 million and you have \$7.4 million to work with it would seem to me that a \$900,000 cushion would be prudent. You wouldn't need to finance that out over 10 years or 12 years. Our concern is basically a bridge financing that runs from November until what ever point in the first quarter or early second quarter the State funds come in. The problem is created by the fact that we have that fiscal calendar year ending there and the rules that apply to it. I can not see taking a 10 year long term solution to what is a five or six month short term problem.

Mr. Haste: I totally agree. In fact I would suggest that is not what we do here. I think if we refinance this that, unlike the other issues, that we not put them off until 2010 or 2011 but that we in fact take these issues and bite the bullet and say this is our obligation, we're going to do it. We are only doing for cash flow reasons only and that we pay them off in the next two years. That is quite possible and I think that is the more prudent way to go. There is no way in the world that this has to be nor should it be in my mind, put out for future generations or over a number of years. This is something that could be done and repaid in the next two years and that is the only way, I would not vote for it to go out to future generations.

Mr. Petrucci: Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of comments that I want to make as well. But unfortunately I have made an appointment with Governor Rendell to be at his residence at 11:00 and I'm five minutes late already to the new Governor. I appreciate very much that we are discussing things here that are critical and I will be leaving and I wanted to have some input on a lot of the issues that are yet to bear here and so it you will allow

me consideration to discuss some of these issues at the time that we are in our Legislative session I would appreciate that.

I do support the passage of the first item there for which you need a vote on today.

Mr. Henry: Could we go out of the regular order of business so we could take that?

Mr. Haste: Actually before he leaves, I think the more critical issue is we need to give, and I think we ought to at least move forward and we can vote it down next week if you chose to do so but I think we need to give, if we are moving forward with that \$4.2 or \$4.3 million, timing is of the essence. I think we need to give Mr. Yohe direction on that issue and have Mr. Verdelli here with a package next week. Because quite frankly if we don't do that then we have missed the opportunity and I don't want to be held responsible for where we may be come October-November.

Mr. Petrucci: My views on that issue is, I recall it wasn't very long ago that we had Mr. Verdelli in with a similar sort of a recommendation. I have difficulty accepting that, increased costs, is going to save us down the line.

Mr. Haste: It isn't.

Mr. Petrucci: However, I wouldn't be opposed to having him come in with another proposal and take a look at it. But I have a much more of an inclination toward wanting to hold back on expenditures and do some adjustments in some of our budgetary affects rather than extend out and go out for refinancing. That would be my inclination. I would look at another proposal.

Mr. Haste: To do that we need to make \$6.5 million of cuts now. And if we are proposing that we are going to cut our budget by \$6.5 million I'm willing to sit here and listen to it.

Mr. Petrucci: That's a big cut.

Mr. Henry: I would listen to that too. If you want to have Mr. Verdelli come in next week with a proposal that's fine. What I'm hearing so far sounds like voodoo economics to me and I would not be in favor of doing that. But if Mr. Verdelli can come in and lay out a plan that would meet all of those objections, I doubt he can, but I'm willing to give Lou a shot.

Mr. Yohe: We are not selling this as saving money. It's not. I think there was some confusion in October as to that effect. No this is not going to save us money. It is going to cost us some money but it will provide cash and budget relief in 2003.

Mr. Petrucci: A line of credit I like. I can understand that. I can accept that. That is a little cost when you actually need the dollars that you are missing. But this sounds like

third world financing. You call it voodoo economics, I call it third world refinancing of their debt that has to occur every once in a while. I don't want to look like a third world county. That's what it appears to me to look like.

Mr. Haste: The only thing I would say, to use both of your phrases, some could argue that's what has put us into this situation.

Mr. Henry: Some would be wrong.

Mr. Yohe: We are proposing the exact same thing we did in 2000-2001.

Mr. Petrucci: They were a little different.

Mr. Henry: It was not the exact same thing.

Mr. Petrucci: They saved money.

Mr. Yohe: No they did not.

Mr. Henry: In the long run they saved.

Mr. Petrucci: It was from a lower interest rate. It wasn't as large of a cost.

Mr. Henry: In any event, we will be happy to entertain additional discussion from Mr. Verdelli a week from today. Or rather on Tuesday of next week. So you have direction on that.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Henry: Items for discussion. Item A, if we could move outside of our regular order of business to accommodate the Commissioner's schedule. Do I have a motion to approve item A?

- A. Agreement between Dauphin County Conservation District and Herbert, Rowland, & Grubic, Inc., for *Engineering Services* for the *Mid-Dauphin Watersheds Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan* for a fee of \$10,023.35. (Fishing Creek, Stoney Creek, Clark Creek, Powell's Creek, Armstrong Creek, and Gurdy Run)
(*NEEDS VOTED ON 01/22/03)**

Mr. Petrucci: So moved.

Mr. Henry: I will second. Mr. Haste has recused himself. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Petrucci: Aye.

Mr. Henry: Aye. Thank you, Commissioner. Please give our regards to our new Governor.

Mr. Petrucci: Thank you. Going back to directors. Anthony White, if the items you have are not pertinent really pressing today could we hold those over to next week so Commissioner Petrucci can be here for that?

Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Henry: Ok. We will go ahead with Facilities Update. Edgar.

Mr. Cohen: Good morning, Commissioners. You should have received a packet showing a summary of January's report. I am pleased that I will be more involved with the Courthouse with Bob Burns. I will give my full cooperation. If there are any questions with the report I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Henry: Commissioner.

Mr. Haste: No.

Mr. Henry: No comments. Mr. White, we will hold a discussion on item D over to the Legislative session on Tuesday. Under Items for Discussion we have voted and dispensed with item A. Commissioner Petrucci has removed item I from the Agenda. I believe there was some interest in discussing item C relative to Professional Engineering Services for Solid Waste Management and Recycling. Commissioner Petrucci had some significant comments and questions there as well. That may be an item that we could also hold over to next week if there is not an objection.

Mr. Haste: Actually I think it needs to be removed. I spoke to Kelly this morning and in fact there may be a better way to go, a less expensive way to go and until they get a chance to look at that I think it is just removed.

Mr. Henry: Ok. Judging from Commissioner Petrucci previous comments I don't think he would have any objections to that. I thought I saw Jim here. Unless Commissioner Petrucci has any objection we will remove item C from the Agenda.

Mr. Burns: Commissioner, if I could interrupt you. I am told that Mr. Robinson, from Economic Development has asked that the Board would consider item F today for action. It is a lease agreement that the Solicitor's office has reviewed and signed off on.

Mr. Henry: This is an extension for their current facility. Commissioner, would you like to vote on this item today?

Mr. Haste: Fine by me.

Mr. Henry: Do I have a motion to approve item F?

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Henry: I'll second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Haste: Aye.

Mr. Henry: Aye. Thank you. We have removed item I. Item L, Commissioner Petrucci may wish to go on record on item L so we can just allow that to hold over to next week as well.

- B. Reappoint Walter W. Cohen to the Dauphin County General Authority. Term will expire – January, 2008.
- C. Professional Engineering Services Agreement between Dauphin County Solid Waste Management & Recycling and Buchart Horn, Inc., to perform the feasibility, equipment selection and siting and design services for the proposed recycling materials recovery facility. (This is State monies and not Dauphin County's General Fund monies)
- D. Year 2002 Liquid Fuels Report to be submitted to the PA Dept. of Transportation.
- E. Proposal from SSI to redo the 40 municipalities Emergency Operations Plan. (EMA)
- F. Lease Extension between Dauphin County and Stonesifer Properties for the Weatherization Dept.
- G. Addendum to Agreement between Dauphin Manor and Healthy Choice Staffing.
- H. Appointments to the Dauphin County Council on Aging:
(Terms 01/01/03 thru 12/31/05)
 - 1. Kay Huber
 - 2. Virginia Bruner
 - 3. Michael Donaldson
 - 4. Marielle Hazen
- I. Creation of Courthouse Renovations Oversight Committee.
- J. Addendum to Agreement between Dauphin Manor and Links 2 Care (formally known as NurseFinders).

- K. Proposal for Telecommunications System Design Services between Dauphin County and Brinjac Engineering, Inc. for the Dauphin Manor project.
- L. Change Orders for Phase I renovations to the Dauphin County Courthouse and Administration Building:
 - 1. Change Order #2002-01-04 with Edwin L. Heim, Company, Electrical Contractor, Project #2002-01, in an add amt. of \$61,002.23. (Dauphin County Courthouse)
 - 2. Change Order #2002-01-02 with L. R. Costanzo Co., Inc., General Contractor, Project #2002-01, in an add amt. of \$371,607.12. (Dauphin County Courthouse)

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Henry: Commissioners' comments. Commissioner Haste.

Mr. Haste: I have nothing more to comment on.

Mr. Henry: Thank you. I have no additional comments. Commissioner Petrucci is not here.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Henry: Do we any public comment on items that were not on today's Agenda?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Henry: Motion to adjourn.

Mr. Haste: So moved.

Mr. Henry: Second. Thank you, all.

Transcribed by: Shari Eagle
January 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Burns, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

printed 04/03/03