



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONERS' WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 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/Chief of Staff; Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Bob Dick, Treasurer; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Tom Guenther, Information Technology Director; Robb Wentzel, EMA Director; John Harlacker, 911 Coordinator; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; George Connor, Economic Development; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office; Lowell Witmer, Clerk of Courts; Noel Falk, Special Projects Coordinator; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Rita Shultz, Domestic Relations Director; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Edgar Cohen, Facility Maintenance Director; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Dan Robinson, Economic Development; and Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Lou Verdelli, Public Financial Management; David Twaddell, Esq., Rhoads & Sinon, LLP; Joseph Ditatranto, Marsh, USA Inc.; Lauren Dobies, Marsh USA, Inc.; John Dormuth, Marsh USA, Inc.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haste: We have five sets of meeting minutes that we'll approve next week.

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.)

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

- A. Lou Verdelli, Public Financial Management; and David Twaddell, Esq., Rhoads & Sinon, LLP
 - 1. Adopt Resolution No. 2-2005 authorizing and directing issuance of a non-revolving line of credit in a maximum principal amount of \$10,000,000.

Mr. Yohe: We have Lou Verdelli from PFM and Dave Twaddell from Rhoads & Sinon to go over our TRAN. I wanted to report that the general fund is down to about \$3 million. It was just under \$3 million yesterday. The sooner we can get this done...I'm still not sure that we are going to need it because there are some of the other funds that have a lot of cash in that probably owe the general fund some money. I want to say that we want to get this done today and get it settled by Friday.

Mr. Haste: Probably owe or do owe?

Mr. Yohe: The other funds always owe us money.

Mr. Verdelli: Similar to last year we developed an RFP and sent that out to several banks. We have those results back. It is the first page behind the green cover. They are structured the same way that we structured it last year. It is on a revolving basis. You are not charged any interest except on the funds that you actually pull down and use. The proposals that we received were from PNC Bank, M&T Bank, and Commerce Bank. The winning proposal is from PNC Bank. Their interest rate is a variable rate equal to 30 day LIBOR plus 62 basis points which today would be a rate of 3.12%. You can see how that compares to M&T Bank where it was the same 30 day LIBOR plus 75 basis points, which today would be 3 3/4. Commerce Bank was 30 day LIBOR plus 150 basis points, which would be 4% today. That rate is variable. We have that feature so you can prepay this money at any time so that once funds do come back in you are able to pay off what you have drawn down. We can get that paid back. Therefore interest is no longer accruing for the County. Everything else is very similar in terms of the structure of the TRAN that was put in place last year. Last year PNC was also the winner on this instrument that you put in place. David Twaddell will review the resolution that you have.

As Mike mentioned if all these documents can be signed today we can do the filing at the State as early as tomorrow and the funds can be available Friday morning for your use.

Mr. Twaddell: You have before you the text of a resolution. I believe it will be designated Resolution #2-2005 that authorizes the issuance of a Tax Anticipation Note to PNC Bank with the terms that Mr. Verdelli has outlined. This is the same resolution that the Board adopted last year for the same purpose. This is a taxable obligation. I would mention for the record that this borrowing is done pursuant to provisions of the Local Government Debt Act specifically for tax anticipation note borrowing. It is not technically considered debt under the statute. Therefore, there is no requirement for an ordinance to be enacted or a published advertisement. You may act on this resolution simply by a motion, seconded by a voice vote. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. Haste: I don't on the legality of the resolution, but I do have one on your notes. Under PNC, it says within the event that LIBOR is unavailable. What would cause LIBOR to be unavailable and how could we track it? We as a Board, how could we track LIBOR so we know where we stand on this?

Mr. Verdelli: It is highly, highly unlikely that LIBOR would be unavailable. It stands for the London Interbank Offering Rate. It is a huge index that worldwide corporations borrowed on LIBOR. Your interest rate swaps that we've done in the past are based off of LIBOR. Every day that index is resetting for millions and billions of dollars worth of loans. I think it is very highly unlikely in terms of monitoring it. Certainly, it would be a major event if suddenly that was not being quoted. We would be aware of it and let you know. I'm sure it would be on the front page of the Wall Street Journal if something like that happened. I was very surprised with all the proposals that we've ever received on these types of things. I've never seen anyone put anything in there that if it was unavailable.

Mr. Haste: That is what drew my attention to it. I don't ever remember that either. I know in the two years that I've been sitting here, LIBOR seems to be the index everybody uses. I'm not really sure what their purpose of putting that in was. I don't think it is anything especially since this is an instrument that's in place just for a year. This isn't a twenty year instrument or anything. I don't think we have too much to worry about there. If in fact it were to revert to the PNC prime rate, obviously that is a different rate but we could look at going elsewhere in getting a different quote because it is pre-payable at any time.

Mr. Twaddell: Anyone can view LIBOR on a daily basis on Wall Street.

Mr. Haste: Are there any other questions?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to adopt Resolution No. 2-2005 authorizing and directing issuance of a non-revolving line of credit in a maximum principal amount of \$10,000,000; motion carried. (A copy of the entire resolution is on file in the Commissioners' Office)

Resolution No 2-2005 – A resolution of the Governing Body of this Local Government Unit authorizing and directing issuance of a non-revolving line of credit to be evidenced by a tax and revenue anticipation note of this local government unit pursuant to the Local Government Unit Debt Act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

- B. Robb Wentzel, EMA Director
1. Presentation of the Act 56 Plan.
 2. Presentation of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) Requirements.
 3. Presentation of the Radiological Emergency Response Procedures (RERP).
 4. Approval of the Dauphin County Wireless 911 Plan for Emergency Management. **(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 02/02/05)**

Mr. Haste: I've been informed that items B, 1 & 4 are actually the same.

Mr. Wentzel: Correct. We're not asking for money and we're not reporting on responses to an incident or a disaster.

First and foremost, I would like to publicly introduce John "Jack" Harlacker who we recently brought on board as our 911 Coordinator and EMA Manager of Communications. Jack is well respected in the first responder community. He is a man of his word and a welcome addition to EMA and the County.

Commissioners: Welcome, Jack.

Mr. Wentzel: On items 1-4 consolidated as one. In December, 2003, the General Assembly of the Commonwealth took steps to comply with what is FCC docket No. 94-102 and enacted Act 56 of 2003. As many of you probably saw on your cell phone bills starting in June of 2004, there was \$1.00 being assessed on every cell phone you had similar to the \$1.25 that is assessed for the Public Safety Telephone Act of 1978 against your hard line bill. As of December 29, 2004, Dauphin County became a Phase II Wireless County. Which means for the six wireless providers in Dauphin County, when they dial 911, we will be able to approximate their location. That is pretty significant considering some of the horror stories we heard in other parts of the country, not here in Dauphin County, where folks who have phones call 911 from their wireless and the 911 center has no way to identify their location.

Mr. Haste: What was the effective date again?

Mr. Wentzel: December 29, 2004. We did our last testing with our last carrier which was T-Mobile. We started this process two years ago to get to this level. We went from a stage where like everybody else or many of the people country-wide, do not know the location of where a wireless caller is. We then went to Phase I which took place in late 2003 and early 2004 which basically gave us, when a cell phone caller called into the com center, called 911, we had a call back number, but we only had a location for the tower site. The call back number was important, knowing how signals are, but the location of the tower site does nothing relative to the location of the caller. The significance of Phase II, while not 100% sure of the location for example if you call from your home and there is a specific address that we can locate you at, we can pinpoint you within a certain proximity where essentially we receive a signal that provides a latitude and longitude which our computer dispatch correlates into a plot on our CAD system and puts a point on the map where we can dispatch the appropriate service. When the SCC originally passed the docket or put the docket out there. It was a requirement that the signal and the location had to be accurate within 125 meters. I will tell you on a case-by-case basis what we get technically in the Com Center pinpoints some locations almost dead on or within 10-15-20 meters. Not as accurate as calling from your home, but considering where we were

when we couldn't find you, if we find you within 20 meters, we can at least put in a first response in the general vicinity. Typically in those type of circumstances we're going to be able to provide the service need that is required.

There were costs associated with basing the way the Act 56 is set up, we can submit or apply for reimbursement of costs and funds to deliver this service. That application date will be March 3, 2005. On July 1 of this year, PEMA will advise us on what they approved from our submission. Then commencing with FY2006 we will receive four quarterly increments of what that reimbursement piece will be.

The Plan that is in front of you today, that we are requesting signature on, is for reimbursement, we are going to be requesting reimbursement in the range of about \$1.6 million. There is no guarantee that we will get the \$1.6 million. There are 67 other counties that are similarly trying to do this. Based upon our location and the various threat assessments and the fact that we are a Phase II Wireless County, for us this document is really a history report. We've done the work that 49 other counties and counting, still have not gotten to yet. So in many of those cases, those counties will be applying for funds to just get to where we are at. We're going to be applying for funds to reimburse us for not only the cost to where we are at but the ongoing costs. This is going to be a perpetual year over year application process where we are going to submit for reimbursement based upon the percentage of wireless calls that we take in the Com Center. As of this report filing, 55.2% of the calls we process to 911 are wireless which is pretty significant.

At a future date, the advisory counsel that is a part of Act 56 that the Governor has appointed, will be revisiting Act 78. These two documents at some point in time will work hand-in-hand. As it stands right now, under Act 78, when we get contributions from the Public Safety Telephone Act Funding we can apply under Act 78 for 70% of those received contributions to offset personnel and benefit costs to run the 911 center.

With Act 56 combined we would be able to seek reimbursement of 91% of our personnel and benefit costs. I'll work with Jack and our partners at PEMA basically to support legislation that would eventually lead to total 100% reimbursement of those costs. From our perspective, at least EMA, not that we are going to communicate on policy for all intense and purposes, you can look at a tax of \$1.25. So all our residents are paying for this service. From a County perspective it only makes sense that we, as a county providing the service, get reimbursement of 100%. At least the personnel piece and the benefit piece to provide that service. That would be the goal from our perspective going forward. The big picture from the end of the day is essentially with your approval of this Plan document we will be submitting for approximately \$1.6 million of reimbursement.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Hartwick: A great job being forward thinking and being in a position to have our County in the lead in this. Where have these costs been charged to for the past two years for the Phase II testing?

Mr. Wentzel: Those costs have been a combination of Act 78 and general fund costs. The costs that we are applying reimbursement for, even though we are applying for \$1.6 million plus or minus, the equipment and personnel costs that come together to make that number are also being utilized simultaneously to provide our Enhanced 911 service that we use continually provide day over day and year over year. Act 56 allows us to take a percentage of wireless

calls 55.2% and secure additional revenue to provide that service. From our standpoint, we've had to make some technical enhancements to upgrade our CAD system to accept the calls where we can identify the location. Those same enhancements are still an existing CAD system.

Mr. Hartwick: Based upon that long response, I can expect that this year's costs may be reimbursed but not the \$1.6 million are going to be taken care of with you claiming the reimbursements. The general fund is not going to see a reimbursement, is what you're telling me?

Mr. Wentzel: The monies won't flow in. If we get \$1.6 million starting October 1st we'll get a check for approximately \$400,000. Then they will flow January 1, 2006, April, & July. How that gets posted and applied, this will be what they call Act 56 monies which is similar to Act 78 monies, have guidelines for which those funds can be expended. There are costs that these monies can be applied for and ineligible funds as well. I think you're going with, can all this be put into the general fund, I would submit right now as I understand Act 56 and there is still some interpretation that has to come down from the Governor's Counsel, not necessarily. Similar to Act 78, only certain eligible costs, only certain requirements can be paid for out of Act 78 funds, for example, the radio project. Act 78 funds can buy towers but they can't buy the land that you put the towers on. Act 56 similarly has those guidelines.

Mr. Hartwick: You were talking about operational costs being the costs that could be used as the bases for reimbursement.

Mr. Wentzel: Correct.

Mr. Hartwick: Those operational costs based upon you getting the \$1.6 million back, is that \$1.6 million going to supplement your operational costs for this year or do you have them earmarked for other projects?

Mr. Wentzel: I will be discussing that with Mr. DiFrancesco. Obviously, there are some projects that were cut from the budget that I would like to share with the Commissioner that we could possibly use this funding to bring them back on the radar screen as they go to supporting the 911 Service. Obviously, relative to the cuts that we made, there maybe some opportunity, for the lack of a better word, to see some pick up and some operational cost offsets.

Mr. Haste: Let me get right to the core of this. This requires a yes or no answer. Were these revenues anticipated in your budget this year?

Mr. Wentzel: No.

Mr. Hartwick: The idea would be if these revenues are received, you're going to use them to try to do projects that you have cut out of the budget last year rather than supplement your current salary and benefits employee costs?

Mr. Wentzel: Correct. I didn't mean to dance on what you were sharing but Act 56 is a work in progress. Essentially, we are writing a history report. The folks at the State also still have to figure out, through the Governor's Advisory Counsel, how to interpret how the act was written. Relative to your questions, there are some simple yes and no answers but in many cases this is still a moving target. The reality is relative to what we know definitively, this is what we feel confident applying for. Back to your question, Commissioner, we do not anticipate these

because quite frankly the original communication when we were in the middle of budget negotiations was Act 56 monies would not be available under calendar 2006 versus federal fiscal year 2006.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Robb, is there anything that leads you to believe that this funding stream will ever stabilize to the point where it is not a cost recovery but there is actually a flow of money sort of in advance of the work?

Mr. Wentzel: Act 56 as it is currently structured is 100% cost recovery. I don't see anything short of basically a rewriting of Act 78 to incorporate Act 56. The positive side of Act 78 is the revenues come directly into our coffers. We can control that where obviously with Act 56 we have to with all intense and purposes incur the expense and then apply for reimbursement.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So the way it looks now you are always going to have to budget for worse case scenario and hope for best case scenario.

Mr. Wentzel: Absolutely. That's from a budget projection standpoint. We will probably always be working with Mike conservatively in the forecast until they get more clear on their interpretation of Act 56.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to approve Item B, 4 (Approval of the Dauphin County Wireless 911 Plan for Emergency Management); motion carries.

3. Presentation of the Radiological Emergency Response Procedures (RERP).

Mr. Wentzel: The next item is the Radiological Emergency Response Procedures. In February, 2004, the Board of Commissioners executed the Emergency Operation Plan. In that plan what was affectionately known and still sometimes called Annex E our response to an incident at TMI. When this document was developed and the Board approved it, it incorporated the other item on the agenda which is the National Incident Management System dictates what have come down from the Department of Homeland Security. With that being updated and promulgated in February, we then embarked on incorporating the National Incident Management System, incident command structure, which are part of our everyday operations in Emergency Management. We essentially updated our radiological emergency response procedures to an incident at TMI. Essentially what is being shared here without getting into the nitty gritty, a lot of this is technical relative to what we would do for an incident but in general this brings our Radiological Emergency Response Procedures in compliance with the support of our Emergency Operations Plan and also makes them compliant with the federal guidance under the National Incident Management System. Significant to that, is when we apply for federal grant money, be it terrorism driven or emergency management driven, we have to be compliant to qualify for that grant funding. This goes hand in hand with the request for a proclamation that Dauphin County has adopted NIMS as its way of operating in Emergency Management mode.

Our County's EMA Counsel has adopted NIMS. All our responses have been written around NIMS or around an incident command structure, which basically in very simple terms that your command structure set up, fire chief responds on the scene, he is the incident commander. As the scene develops, you establish basically almost a military type organization span of control

where no commander essentially has responsibility for more than three to five people. All those languages are endorsed by the Department of Homeland Security and are written into our EOP which was adopted last year with the old Annex E which was last updated in 2001. This Annex E which is reviewed annually by the Emergency Management Agency going forward is now in compliance with the EOP.

Mr. Hartwick: Does this plan document include the Emergency Plans and Evacuation Plans for day care centers?

Mr. Wentzel: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: I know that was a hot issue.

Mr. Wentzel: It remains a hot issue. One of the challenges which I'm sure you're more than well aware of with the day care pieces, you have the license facilities, and then you have for a lack of better words, the single proprietors that nobody really knows about. Relative to the legislation, we have participated with state supported classes that have been given to the day care centers. Our Penn State Co-operative Extension Director, Jane Landis, has hosted some of those classes where they have done their presentations where the state has come in and done presentations specifically to the day care owner operators and then we've also provided them with about an hour of those type sessions where we can share with them some insights. From our perspective and from the stat's perspective which I know is still being debated, we as the Emergency Management Agency do not write their plans but we do support, facilitate their awareness, make recommendations relative to training and some things they can do to be better informed should the unfortunate incident occur, be it a TMI incident, be it something as simple as a fire in a trash can in their own facility. What do you do to get out?

Mr. Hartwick: In that Plan, do we sort of give day cares guidelines or do we require their plans to be included in our overall submission?

Mr. Wentzel: Their specific plans, the guidelines for their plan is provided by the state. They have reporting requirements to the state. We keep file copies in our agency of their day care plans and we have an accounting of the facilities that we're aware of; not just a TMI incident. Flooding which is more a regular occurrence that if there is a need for an evacuation, in all hazard types instead of an incident specific type that we could be able to provide to our local coordinators, the response, assistance and resources needed to facilitate those type of action plans.

Mr. Hartwick: You have a list of day cares that are on the books?

Mr. Wentzel: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: For the man on the street, I know we have some concerns with how the funding flows. But the way these different programs have been set up, in terms of planning, there has been adequate communication both up and down the line to make sure the plan that we actually have meets the needs. Has the federal government set down mandates that we have to jump through hoops but....

Mr. Wentzel: I will assure you that our plans are dynamic. As we experienced after Ivan, whenever there is an incident, regardless of how small or how large, we always go back and look at our plans. What could we have done better? Where did we do well? Our plans were

constantly in a state of flux. These are not fixed documents where after we leave the room today, they go on the shelf and never be seen again except for May with the biannual exercise and we put them away for two more years. There is room to improve. Obviously, our concern on a local level or County level, is when those decisions are needed at the federal and state level and how they trickle down to us. We do have a mechanism where and to PEMA's credit, they have become more proactive in communicating with us at the County level where we have at least a comment period where we can go back up stream and challenge some of the things that come down. I will share with you that always doesn't become adopted but in many cases as long as we meet the general edits of the funding sources that are available, we basically write your plan around your local needs. In our case right now while there is always room for improvement, a plan is never 100% acceptable. I think it is as good as it is going to get until the next incident. We'll test it. We'll challenge it. We exercise it. The job will get done.

Mr. DiFrancesco: One of the concerns raised, you mentioned that the plan is designed so that adequate resources can be brought to bear wherever the incident is, we're still dealing with the issue that a major flood happened in this area. Everybody knows that water plants are being knocked out of operation and when you send a simple request for water up through the channels, it comes back and says, we can't give you any water for your site. So we have to go to Giant Food who again, I want to thank, they stepped in and gave us what we needed. Bottom line is, it is great to have a channel there where resources should flow, but the resources have to actually flow through the channel when they are needed.

Mr. Wentzel: I think what we've learned from Ivan has clearly identified a more proactive way of thinking recognizing requests that go through the feds have to be preceded by a Governor's Declaration. Having said that, we plan on the front end to try to identify resources that would be available to us. For example, as we were talking early this morning, our homes, our day care facilities are required to maintain storage stock levels of certain items, example potable water, to help them sustain their operations for a day or two. Those are legislated by the state and the feds. There are some things that we can do creatively at the local level and County level. We are in this type of discourse and dialogue. The key is to identify those resources before the disaster hits. When the river is flowing out of its banks, that's not the time to be figuring out where you're going to find sandbags, where you're going to find vehicles to evacuate people. That's part of the TMI plan and would be our emergency operations plan. That's what we're working on right now to expand that resource list. If the river floods in the middle of the winter and we have forty inches of snow on the ground and we have ice jams, recognize the roadways are going to be frozen, the river is going to be out of its banks, as are the creeks, so I submit to you that the normal needs for doing evacuations, be it buses, aren't going to be practical. So you're looking probably for some type of military transportation be it a two and one half ton or five ton truck that is better capable of handling adverse weather conditions. Our Emergency Operations Center, when activated, has provisions to bring the Red Cross in and bring a PennDOT representative in, to basically bring in resources where a municipality may not be able to move snow because it's beyond their capability.

Identify resources like the giants of the world. The Walmarts who have emergency management grants, they work with their local municipalities. The identification of places where we can quickly tap into resources to help in the interim until the Governor makes a state declaration and the federal government can bring in its resources. There is always a time impact of any incident. The process has to work. It is our job at the County level and with our local EMC's to basically identify resources that are available to us that can basically buy us time until the feds can step in and provide resources that they are required to provide. Our plans account for that and we continue to refine our resource data base to be able to meet that need.

Mr. Haste: Do you need action by this Board or do you just need to present it?

Mr. Wentzel: On the RERP, basically just the adoption of the Plan through the Solicitor's Office there has been a promulgation page provided. We do not need to expedite that as with the Act 56. So that can wait until the Legislative session next week.

On the National Incident Management System, I provided Diane a template similar to what the State proclaimed relative to its adoption of NIMS. I will work with Diane. That is just a proclamation the County adopts. That can wait for February 9th.

C. John Dormuth, Vice-President of Marsh USA, Inc.

1. Continuity of Government.

Mr. Esworthy: Before you, you'll see a handout from Marsh for the continuity of government plan. As EMA is doing for the County, we need to do a plan also for effective continuation of business here at the government level in case of an emergency such as a fire or flood.

Approximately nine months ago, we received information from Homeland Security via PEMA to do a continuation of government plan. As a result of that, we applied to PEMA for a grant of \$60,000 which we then used to engage Marsh to work with us. Since that time, Marsh has interviewed approximately two-thirds of all department heads and row officers and courts to develop this plan. Today, I bring them before you to meet the team that is here and give you an update of where we are at. With that I would like to introduce, John Dormuth.

Mr. Dormuth: I work for Marsh here in Harrisburg. In fact, we are on the other side of Market Street in the Penn National Insurance Building. My role with Marsh is an Account Coordinator, account management type, managing the services of Marsh with our clients. Marsh is a large professional services firm. There are about 70 offices around the country and also some offices around the globe. We provide risk management services, as well as, insurance brokerage services. Certainly in this area, it falls into the risk management area. I have Joe Ditaranto and Lauren Dobies here today. Joe has been in this field of continuity for 30 years. Joe is a project leader on this particular plan. Lauren is an assistant to Joe.

As Garry said, we've met with approximately 30 of about 50 individuals that we would need to speak with in developing this plan. We're going to be working with the Court Administrator with regard to the Dauphin County judges and their preferences as things affect them.

(A slide presentation was done by Marsh)

We are probably midway through our project.

- This document on slide four – what is the continuity of government plan? By definition, it is the identification and protection of government process required to maintain acceptable level of operations in an event of any interruptions of these processes and their supporting resources.
- Why is it important to have a continuity of government plan? Essentially it is to minimize the loss of services, reduce impact, and assure continuity of Dauphin County's critical

processes and functions. It is also to rapidly recover to meet critical Dauphin County needs and minimize confusion.

Bullets on the next slide and continuity of government functions.

- Identify and prioritize critical functions.
- Devise a recovery strategy and create awareness and acceptance of the plan.
- Overall objective is to disseminate information to agencies, groups, and individuals, continuation of services to the citizens of Dauphin County in the event of a man made or natural disaster which initiates service interruption or stoppage.
- The next slide is merely just a slide to show the overall methodology and creating a plan of this kind.

As far as risk assessment, government impact and analysis, that's what we talk about meeting with individuals. That's what we are talking about here. Individual interviews or discussions where we can gather information and then develop a strategy and a plan and then refine that plan and test it. From there, it is the Dauphin County's responsibility to continue to update and revise as necessary.

It completely focuses on services of Dauphin County, that is what the objective is here.

I would be happy to take your questions?

Mr. Haste: What is the time line?

Mr. Dormuth: Maybe Garry would like to speak to that at this point.

Mr. Esworthy: The time line right now, we're looking to have this completed probably by mid-April. The next step that we will be looking at is meeting with the courts after the new President Judge is seated. Then go back to each department. We're finding out that is a big relationship with the Clerk of Courts, Prothonotary, Records of Deeds and working with the court system. So we are waiting until everything is seated there. That will be our final group to start meeting with.

Mr. Haste: I assume then the beginning of April, we will have a draft or something of the plan?

Mr. Esworthy: We will have a draft of the plan by the beginning of April.

Mr. Haste: Once we have this plan, what do we do with it?

Mr. Esworthy: Once we have this plan, we'll make sure that each individual department knows and understands that plan and is ready to implement that plan in case of an emergency within their department. The emergencies can be such as what occurred at D. J. Zozo's Office this past weekend when they had a slight flooding and getting that back up and running. Two years ago when D. J. Zozo's office was on fire and getting that back up and running, and relocating resources for them. So that is what we want to do. Again, this plan is a living document where we will constantly be updating it.

Mr. Haste: That will be your responsibility?

Mr. Esworthy: That will be my responsibility.

Mr. Hartwick: Is \$60,000 going to cover the entire cost of the plan?

Mr. Esworthy: It will more than cover the entire cost of the plan.

Mr. Ditaranto: We've agreed to work with them.

Mr. Saylor: This was a topic for a director's meeting last year and gave them a heads up that this was going to be happening. I presume since I haven't heard anything, you're getting full cooperation from everybody and there are no.....

Mr. Esworthy: We're getting full cooperation. Again, one of the things we're finding is the understanding and educating the directors and why it is necessary. They're very forthcoming and working with us.

SALARY BOARD

(The Minutes of the Salary Board Meeting are on file in the Commissioners' Office.)

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: In the personnel packet, I have one request to fill a vacancy in the District Attorney's office. This was actually intended to be in the packet last week. We accidentally omitted it. It is a full time deputy district attorney position funded 100% by the Weed and Seed Grant. There are some changes, start dates and two suspensions and some employee separations. There are no new hires in this packet. We have the overtime listing and a request for overtime at the Prison. That is all that is in the packet.

Mr. Hartwick: Kay, Faye, myself and Chad have met to try to change a little bit about the look, readability and the ease of getting through the personnel packet. I would like to hear from the Commissioners if there are any changes following the meeting today. This is a work in progress hopefully to make it easier for all of us during the course of the meeting. Also, one other thing that I requested of Kay, instead of having these requests coming in at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday morning, we wanted to make sure that if anybody does not have their request in for personnel transaction that is not an emergency transaction by Monday, it is not going to be included on the salary packet in the personnel packet. There is not going to be any more Wednesday morning requests that we're getting phone calls saying hey, did you know about this? If they need to submit it on Wednesday morning, they need to have a very, very good justification for having to provide that request at such a late hour. It's not in by the close of day Monday, it won't appear.

Mr. Haste: That's good.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: The item I gave you is an item that I would like to have added to the packet for consideration next week. I didn't get it in time to get it in the packet but it is something that Mr. Guenther said he has already discussed with his oversight and that you guys are aware of.

That will be for approval in the packet for next week. I nit picked my way through this packet and feel that all the calls from all the departments that don't like me and was able to get the packet with no budget adjustments. It should be in the same form next week along with the item for Information Technology. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Hartwick: What is #2 of page 26?

Mr. Baratucci: Those are all updates as a result of all the meetings that they've had with Manatron. They have determined that these are the ongoing yearly costs for the support and maintenance of the system. Steve, can give you details if that is what you're looking for.

Mr. Hartwick: I want to find out about them.

Mr. Baratucci: Okay.

Mr. Haste: Are there any more questions?

Mr. Hartwick: I do have one more question. The HVAC contract from McClure, this is the second year of the third year contract. Do we have the opportunity to get in or out of that contract next year? You say it is a three year contract but do we have to renew this year? Do we have the option to get out or what is the deal?

Mr. Baratucci: There is a clause in most of our contracts that allows us an out if we are unhappy with the service, usually through a 60 day notice. It was set up as a three year agreement to hold the price for those three years. Next year we would obviously be negotiating then for the following year, another three year agreement or whatever.

Mr. Hartwick: That's all I need to know, thanks.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: I saw nothing on the training packet that we need to deal with at this time.

Mr. Saylor: No action is required this week.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. Resolution No. 3-2005 adopting GIS prices and order forms (I.T.)
(*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 2/02/05)**
- B. GIS Data License Agreement between Dauphin County and Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.
(*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 2/02/05)**
- C. License Agreement between Dauphin County and Strawberry Square Development Corporation for use of the Atrium area for County Government Day on Tuesday, April 12, 2005.
(*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 02/02/05)**
- D. Reappoint Alfredo Gonzalez to the Mental Health/Mental Retardation Advisory Board. (Term will expire February 9, 2008)

- E. Adopt Resolution No. 4-2005 authorizing the allocation of \$25,000 from the Dauphin County Office of Community & Economic Development Small Business Loan Program awarded to RS Management Enterprises, Inc.
- F. Approve Small Business Loan Applications for the following individuals:
 - 1. BARJ Providence, LLC
 - 2. Perfection Cleaning Services, Inc.

Mr. Haste: I see Items A, B, & C request action. Part of that and I know at least A & B, we've been talking about moving some items forward particularly our GIS information so we can start to generate revenue. Even though we will start out small we want to be able to generate some revenue. Item A is to do that and Item B is already an opportunity to get some revenue.

Mr. Hartwick: Are we asking for a vote at this time?

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve Items A, B, & C?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve the following items; motion carries.

- A. Resolution No. 3-2005 adopting GIS prices and order forms (I.T.)
(A VOTE IS REQUESTED 2/02/05)**
- B. GIS Data License Agreement between Dauphin County and Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.
(A VOTE IS REQUESTED 2/02/05)**
- C. License Agreement between Dauphin County and Strawberry Square Development Corporation for use of the Atrium area for County Government Day on Tuesday, April 12, 2005.
(A VOTE IS REQUESTED 02/02/05)**

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions on E or F? (There were none.)

SOLICITOR'S REPORT – BILL TULLY, ESQ.

Mr. Tully: There is nothing to add.

CHIEF CLERK'S REPORT – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: I note that tonight is the much anticipated "State of the County Address". It is an all go and everyone is waiting for it with much anticipation, as I said.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Haste: Is there anything else that needs to be brought before the Board at this time? (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? (There was none)

ADJOURNMENT

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

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk
February 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

printed 7/13/05