



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONERS WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2004

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; Robert Knupp, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; Marie Rebuck, Controller; Robert Dick, Treasurer; Barry Wyrick, MH/MR Administrator; Jeff Patton, Juvenile Probation; Steve Sukniac, Juvenile Probation, Director; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Kelly Wolf, Solid Waste; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Diane McNaughton, Communications; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Chip Vance, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Wayne Gerhold; Andrew Giorgione; Chris Markley; Mel Jacobson; Thomas Smida

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 three sets of Minutes that we will take up at next week's meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: At this point in time the floor is open for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board at this time? (There was none.)

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: The first item in the personnel packet is the Salary Board request for a temporary Resource Planner Technician in the Conservation District. Due to some new federal regulations, additional storm water studies need to be done. This person would assist with that among other tasks. The position is funded by a grant. It wouldn't be any cost to the County.

In the vacancies, there are two part time law clerk positions in the District Attorney's Office. Spring Creek is hiring an assistant administrator. We are requesting to fill that vacancy, as well as an accounting assistant; medical billing positions, custodian and two housekeeping aides at Spring Creek. There are some positions in Juvenile Probation that we are requesting to fill.

In the new hires listing, I request that there be a vote on some Spring Creek positions and request approval for today. These people are starting May 17. That is the date of orientation. That's why their hires would need approved at today's meeting. They would be items 9 through and including 16.

In the changes listing, there are two Adult Probation Officers that are just flip-flopping positions. The effective date of their transfer is May 10. I would request that a vote be taken today and approval be given for those two items, 1 & 2.

We have the overtime reports and a request for overtime from the Prison. The Prison has been keeping their overtime way under the amount of hours that were requested. That's all I have.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just to add for the Board, on today's agenda we have identified a very good and qualified candidate for the Assistant Administrator's job. This would be the first position at Spring Creek in the senior management – top management that we would be replacing. The search continues for the administrator's position, the director of nursing position; and the director of the business office position. At least we are

starting to put the pieces back together. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer those also.

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions for Kay? If not, is there a motion to approve Items 9 through 16 on the new hires listing?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve items 9 through 16 on the new hires listing; motion carries.

Mr. Haste: Thanks, Kay.

Ms. Sinner: On the changes listing, items 1 & 2 for Adult Probation because the transfers were effective May 10?

Mr. Haste: Yes, that is just the swap of the two positions. Is there also a vote to approve items 1 & 2 on the changes listing?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to approve items 1 & 2 on the changes listing; motion carries.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: You should have all received your purchase order packet yesterday. There are no changes to it. There are some over budgets as usual that need some adjustments made to the line items. We'll take care of those between now and next week. If you have any questions on it, I can answer them otherwise that will be updated for your approval next week.

RECYCLING CENTER BIDS

Mr. Baratucci: If you don't have any questions on the purchase orders, there is another item that I didn't get a chance to get on the agenda. We just received this from Paul Navarro. This is the ongoing bidding process for the recycling center that we are building. If you will recall a couple of weeks ago, we did award two of the three contracts. We awarded the electrical contract and the HVAC/plumbing contract. We needed to do another re-bid on the general because one of the bidders mistakenly had bad math on his bid. We did do that re-bid. We opened them last week. Actually the same bidder, Conewago Contractors was the low bid again. There is a letter in front of you from Paul Navarro our engineer recommending that we award the bid to Conewago. Their bid amount is \$1,111,400. Attached to that letter is the bid tabs for the general construction. At the bottom I added all three of the contracts together. As you see, they total just over \$1.4 million. In addition to the \$1.4 million, Paul's fees will probably run in the neighborhood of \$200,000. So the entire project will be about \$1.6 million. The grant I think that Kelly had received was for \$1.5 million. But she has assured us that the other \$100,000 can be paid out of the Solid Waste funds. We are asking today because we want to keep this project moving, if you could approve the low

bid award to Conewago so that Paul can move forward to get the proper documentation and actually get the construction underway. If you have any questions, I can answer them and also Kelly is here.

Mr. Haste: Kelly, would you please come to the microphone? You talked about making a second application to DEP for the equipment. Where are we on that?

Ms. Wolf: Right now we are in the process of writing the grant for the equipment. We met with DEP for our pre-application meeting. They indicated to us that we probably would get the money for the equipment but they can't guarantee it of course. They did fund the \$1.5 million for the facility. I'm not sure if the other Commissioners are aware but when we first received the grant a while back, it was for \$1.5 million and that was including free equipment that DEP was going to repossess from western Pennsylvania from another facility. That fell through so that left us with \$1.5 million to construct and equip the facility. The equipment itself is about \$1 million. We are in the process of writing the grant and it will be submitted by June 6th and before the Board prior to that for your approval.

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions for Kelly?

Mr. Hartwick: Just related to the extra \$100,000 from the project, where is that money going to come from?

Ms. Wolf: Administrative fees.

Mr. Hartwick: Okay.

Ms. Wolf: That \$100,000 is also reimbursable in the current grant.....no we would need to reapply for a grant to get reimbursed for that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: For clarity purposes, it's not encumbered or under budgeted money that we are talking about shifting over. You can do it within the fees that you are getting?

Ms. Wolf: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Andy do you want to take this opportunity to give us an update on the incinerator project?

Mr. Giorgione: I think I have reported before, the environmental remediation asbestos abatement is now complete. That came in at about \$70,000 under budget. The demolition work is in progress. That should be complete by May 18. That came in at about \$390,000 under budget. The repair and extension of the stack has been awarded at \$67,000 under budget. The turbine generator will be awarded Friday. It looks like that is going to come in at about \$362,000 under budget. So far, even though we are in the early stages of the project we're close to \$900,000 under budget. So things are

proceeding. The interesting aspect about being under budget is, we have put together construction documents for the total project which is close to \$82 million. The engineer who designed the facility has provided a guaranteed maximum price for the project. But we have provisions in those contracts that allow for sharing in the savings. Even though they gave us a GMP in the normal cases when you have a GMP, the contractor then keeps the savings because it takes the upside risk. Here we have a 60/40 split where the Authority would get 60% of the savings and the contractor getting 40%. So at this point, I estimate that we are over half a million that would be saved by the Authority on the project.

The one aspect of the project that we have been waiting to hear about that we went into not knowing fully is how it would shake out was the steam line. Originally working with NRG who is the company that runs the Harrisburg Steam Works and who would be receiving under the long term contract all of the steam, they had done some work looking at different sections of the steam line and had in their own mind felt that about \$3 million would be needed to upgrade the steam line. Therefore, in the project financing we tucked away about \$3 million to work on the steam line. We now have had a more formal report and analysis done of the steam line. That is now in its second draft where Dan has been meeting with NRG and has been meeting with the entity that has put the steam report together. It looks like at this point their estimating that the cost to repair the steam line could be closer to \$5 million. But they feel in discussions with NRG, that this could be a 25 year fix. So it could be a long term fix for the steam line. In terms of what we have right now, \$3 million that's available through the project financing, we also have current savings right now of a half million dollars which we hope will be more. Before you today we have a new insurance product, I'll call it an insurance product by analogy, for the cap that could generate about \$1.1 million in savings. You got construction interest and certain interest savings that we're enjoying right now because in the project finance we budgeted about 3.35% for interest and interest costs are closer to 1% right now. All together the Authority and the City feels very comfortable that the \$5 million will be available to get this project done and that it is going to be a long term fix for the steam line. At least for the life of the project which would be 25 years. Although we are still very early in the project, things are going very well. We expect essentially the meat of the project, meaning the construction of the facility, to start by the end of this month which is pouring the foundation for this plant.

Mr. Haste: When would the steam line work happen?

Mr. Giorgione: I don't know the answer to that question. I would suspect that the plant is not going to come on line until late 2006. The work itself although extensive won't take more than 3 to 6 months. Of course, it would be a publicly bid project. So at this point I think we have to define the scope, have the engineers put together what we believe is going to be the long term fix. Then we would have to go out on bid for that. So I would suspect maybe in the next six months or so you are going to see that start taking shape.

Mr. Haste: Okay.

Mr. Hartwick: Andy, do you have a copy of the list of the RFP's that went out on the street for the project and for the bids that have been awarded to this point?

Mr. Giorgione: I do.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there any way you could provide that to us?

Mr. Giorgione: In writing?

Mr. Hartwick: Yes, please.

Mr. Giorgione: Okay, I will email something over.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just on a side note, could you give me information in terms of the agreement with the incinerator where the ash is going?

Mr. Giorgione: Sure.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Which would be more an agreement between the incinerator and whoever the disposal company would be. I would like a feel for where that ash is going.

Mr. Giorgione: Obviously, there is still onsite landfill capacity that will be for the near future. We do have an agreement for long term. One of the interesting aspects is that recently DEP is starting to permit facilities to use the ash for daily cover for landfills so that is called a beneficial reuse to the extent that we can get a lot more agreements with landfills to use it. They will take it for free which of course there is no disposal fee which is another cost saving for the project. We do have contracts in place and I can provide those.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Baratucci: I still need you to take a vote on that bid award.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to award the bid to Conewago Contractors?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to award a bid to Conewago Contractors, general contractors, for the construction of the recycling center; at a bid amount of \$1,111,400.00; motion carries.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Saylor: You have the training packet before you. All the items have been pre-approved and none need action today.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATION CELEBRATING NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK – MAY 10-16, 2004

Mr. Haste: At this point in time we have a proclamation to be awarded. Commissioner DiFrancesco will present the proclamation.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I am honored today to issue a proclamation from the Board. Dauphin County is blessed in many, many ways and one of those ways is I believe we have very strong partners in this community looking out for the health care of our community and not just in their professional expertise, but also in terms of their commitment to the local community in what they give back and what they do. So if I could just have a minute I would like to read this proclamation from the Dauphin County Board of Commissioners and award it to some folks that are in the audience.

Office of County Commissioner Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Proclamation

We, the Dauphin County Board of Commissioners, proudly honor the hospitals in this county and this Commonwealth, along with the remarkable people who bring these buildings to life, as we celebrate National Hospital Week, May 10 to May 16, 2004;

Whereas, hospitals ensure the health of our loved ones through the capable, compassionate, around-the-clock labors of doctors, nurses, administrators, technicians, food service workers and others who make a sterile hospital room a home away from home when someone is ill, injured, undergoing surgery or awaiting the miracle of childbirth;

Whereas, hospitals have a particularly proud tradition in Pennsylvania, for the pioneering Keystone State bears the distinction of housing this nation's first hospital;

Whereas, Pennsylvania is also home to the nation's first teaching hospital, children's hospital, cancer hospital, eye hospital, and nursing school;

Whereas, we join patients and families across Dauphin County and the country in hailing the ability of hospitals to heal and to help, to bring medicine, hope and support amidst sickness and pain, mending bones, lifting spirits, touching hearts and saving lives;

Whereas, when we are at our sickest and weakest, hospitals are at their best, providing medical attention with unmatched technology, skill, patience and devotion;

Therefore, on behalf of the 251,300 residents of Dauphin County, we pay tribute to the critical role of each and every hospital by formally declaring May 10 through May 16, 2004 as "National Hospital Week" in Dauphin County; and we heartily appreciate and applaud the life-altering, life-sustaining and life-saving labors of love performed day in and day out in the emergency rooms, operating rooms, corridors and patient wings of our many state-of-the-art hospitals, for their care knows no limits.

In witness thereof, we have hereunto set our hand and caused the seal of the Commissioners of Dauphin County to be affixed this 12th day of May, 2004.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm not sure who all we have in the audience today to come up to receive the proclamation. We have Pinnacle Health here. Mr. Christopher Markley will accept the proclamation on behalf of all medical providers.

JEAN WIEBNER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE RUTHERFORD HOUSE SENIOR CENTER

Ms. Wiebner: I'm Jean Wiebner, Executive Director of the Rutherford House Community Senior Center, at 3300 Parkview Lane.

Mr. Connor: Jean will be requesting CDBG un-program funds out of the 2002 fund for \$38,500. Mr. Saylor and Mr. Cohen went out to the facility and assessed the damage that was done. I don't know if Edgar wants to say a few words about the building.

Ms. Wiebner: The building as you know is a County owned building. It has suffered many years of neglect. For the past several years I've been acquiring CDBG grants as a phased renovation project. We have been granted the funds although they were short of what the request was. At this time, we have a severely leaking roof. We are getting a new roof right now but that's just over the auditorium. There are other flat roofs that are leaking so severely that you can see the damage in the photos that I gave you. We also have to repair the damage to the interior walls. There is a retaining wall outside that is absolutely deteriorated. We need some maintenance on the air conditioner unit. There is a room divider in the auditorium that is in desperate need to be replaced because of the roof situation over the auditorium. I did want to address one item that may not sound as if it is a renovation project. But to better let the community know that we are there, we can't afford advertising on a grand basis to let everybody know that we are there. We are the first senior center in Dauphin County. We were established 33 years ago. We desperately, desperately need a sign with changeable letters to let the public know what goes on at this center. So many people know the building but they don't know what goes on in there. There is only so much advertising that we can do. So that is part of my request. The funding for that sign.

Mr. Haste: How much is the sign?

Ms. Wiebner: The sign is approximately \$3,200. I just purchased for the Community Wellness Fair that we are having in June, a banner because we have to reach the public. They can drive by but they still don't know what it is. The people a lot of times don't read advertising. But I purchased a banner at \$250. I could just change the letters on a sign and have every program and event advertised. It would be a great spot to put it, right on the edge of the property. You could see it from Paxton Street. There is a lot of traffic there. That's a very important part of this grant.

Mr. DiFrancesco: What type of advertising are you doing now?

Ms. Wiebner: Depending on our finances and depending on how large the event is, we get non-profit rates from the East Shore Shopper and the West Shore Shopper, small local newspapers, senior news and occasionally if we could find the funds through sponsors or vendors, we'll put in a small ad in the Patriot News. We also do some radio. We do the free cable access channel and the Community Bulletin Board thing.

Mr. DiFrancesco: What about the MetroEast in the activity section?

Ms. Wiebner: We are in the Patriot News every Tuesday in the Senior Living Section. But I send press releases to everybody and if they pick them up, they pick them up.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Do they have a schedule of activities that is more or less free?

Ms. Wiebner: Yes, but if they like the press release then they put it in. It is not a guarantee.

Mr. Hartwick: Take a look at the wall cost, how much is estimated to repair the wall and the retaining wall?

Ms. Wiebner: The outside wall, \$8,500. We did get a donation and I purchased \$400 worth of mulch and had the Work Release Adult Probation Program pull the weeds and put the mulch down. But that wall itself, is about \$8,500 to replace it with concrete and the landscape blocks.

Mr. Hartwick: We are not talking about replacing them with the same type railroad ties you currently have?

Ms. Wiebner: No, they are dry rotted and termite infested.

Mr. Hartwick: If we could find railroad ties, I just happen to be the former Mayor of Steelton and there is a lot of railroad ties around where I live. We also have prisoners and as you said Work Release folks, that could be able to do the labor for free. I'm sure we could get that estimate down to almost zero for the wall. Maybe putting something together like that will reduce the amount that we would have to spend on that piece almost immediately.

Ms. Wiebner: Okay, whatever as long as it doesn't fall down. That's all that I'm worried about. We had one of the prisoners, well actually one of the Work Release gentleman, fall off that wall while they were putting the mulch in. He's all right.

Mr. Haste: In your comment you said, the Rutherford House was neglected for the last few years but it appears that through CDBG and the state over the last three years there has been \$296,959 put into this building.

Ms. Wiebner: Right.

Mr. Haste: That doesn't sound like neglect.

Ms. Wiebner: Thank you, the previous decade when I was not there, nothing was done, nothing! It seems like a lot of money but if you look at – it is a 146 year old building. The addition was built 20 years ago and nothing has been done, nothing! So I became Executive Director four years ago and most of my job has been trying to get grants to fix this County owned building. That's what you see – that's the numbers. Although those numbers may sound grand but there is so much to be done. We were cut short on that roofing project. Right now the roofers are there today putting on the roof over the auditorium but between the auditorium which is the addition that was built in 1985 and the original historic home which was built in 1858, there are offices and flat roofs and a lobby. Those flat roofs we did not get the funding for. That's what is damaging the historic building because it is right up against it. It comes down the side.

Mr. Haste: Have you worked with the Aging Department on this problem at all?

Ms. Wiebner: Through the years, I have tried but they don't have any funding. They have already suffered a cut themselves.

Mr. Connor: The budget for Aging is what?

Mr. Hartwick: \$75,000.

Mr. Connor: That goes towards what, administration?

Ms. Wiebner: Yes, administration. It goes to building repairs. It goes to insurance, telephone bills, utilities, oil. We did put in a new furnace. Now the new roof. As soon as the 2004 CDBG money is available we will put in a second exit for the second floor, a fire escape so that we can use the whole building. Because that has been renovated and we are waiting for the second exit to go in and a fire alarm system. So we are utilizing a whole other section of the building now that has never been used before well, since 1978.

Mr. Haste: I'm just going to think out loud a little bit. If in fact, because I think this is the most that we give to any senior center, \$75,000 is our max.

Ms. Wiebner: Heinz also gets that.

Mr. Haste: It appears if we are constantly struggling for money, I'm wondering if that is the best location for a senior center.

Ms. Wiebner: I think it is the best location for a senior center. I think it is. We've been there for so long. Maybe the solution would be to take a look at other senior centers and see that maybe their locations are the right locations to have a senior center. There are so many of them within blocks of each other. If you maybe, well I'm thinking out

loud now too, if you consolidate it. Because like I said we were the first senior center to be established from Governor Milton Shapp and his wife Muriel in 1978. So we have a 33 year history. We were meant to be a satellite. Other branches shot off of us, like the smaller senior centers. Now it's over developed, over funded and here we are struggling because the little church basement senior centers are getting funding and smaller senior centers that are open several hours a day. We're a huge business that has to survive on that.

Mr. Connor: One of you mentioned to me about budget, I don't know what the square footage is of your building. You said the square footage of the other building gets the same amount of funds as you do.

Ms. Wiebner: Right.

Mr. Connor: And you guys are trying to operate a larger facility on the same amount of funding from Aging.

Ms. Wiebner: I have to keep going back to the County owned building aspect where we are the only one in the County owned building that I know of and we are responsible for the maintenance. And it is a historic property. That's a lot of money. It takes a lot of money to keep up a mansion like that. I mean it looks great on the outside but you have to look at everything. Like in your home, if you lived in a 146 year old home!

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think that brings it back to the question that Commissioner Haste asked. You just said a couple of things - first of all for accessibility of senior centers, you want to be in neighborhoods and close to people for people to walk to. So the satellite system seems to make a lot of sense. It does make sense that you want to operate your facility in a building that is not draining a lot of resources off a lot of your time; and it sounds like it is the ultimate thing because the money is coming from grants, etc. But you are spending a lot of time chasing that money down. So the question does remain, is this the best place to have it located? I guess the question that I have, is more internally. When we are setting this strategy on repairs and etc.; who is setting that time table, what repairs get done, when they get done, who is keeping track, and how the project is bid out, etc. Is that everything that comes through this Board?

Ms. Wiebner: The Redevelopment Authority has a lot of that responsibility.

Mr. Haste: I think under the lease it's the responsibility of your association.

Ms. Wiebner: Right.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Because of the dollar arrangement.

Ms. Wiebner: Correct.

Mr. Haste: Again, it would make some sense. It sounds like it is inexpensive at a \$1.00 a year, but in fact the building is not adequate for the services, then it's not inexpensive any more. It's becoming costly.

Ms. Wiebner: We're not talking about an ongoing issue of repairs. Once it is done, this has been 20 years since anything has been done to that building. So all of a sudden you have a bulk need for a lot of repairs. We're almost there. You don't need a new furnace every year. We finally got a new furnace. That was in that building for 45 years.

Mr. Haste: I'm not sure it has been 20 years. I was Chief Clerk from 1988 to 1996 and I remember us putting money into that building back then. I don't remember what it was for but I remember money going out there before.

Ms. Wiebner: I don't know. I wasn't involved in 1978. The addition was put on in 1985. I know that our Board of Directors had a large fundraising campaign in 1985 to add that addition and a lot of community support. That's how that addition came about with the auditorium. We are so fortunate to have that building. There is none other like it. Other senior center directors come to our building and say we are so jealous. You have so much to offer. We can have programs there that no other senior center can offer, none! I'll honestly tell you in the state, nobody can offer what we can offer because of that building!

Mr. Hartwick: Do you have statistics on how many seniors you serve at the center?

Ms. Wiebner: Since we charge no membership, we don't keep a membership list. We do keep a tally of who attends the center every day as far as numbers for programs. I can estimate maybe 75 a day. There will be more though once we open up that second floor and offer more programs on the second floor of the building. But our programs, we get well over a 100 people.

Mr. Hartwick: How often do you do programs? Do you have a daily schedule?

Ms. Wiebner: It's constant, yeah. There may be one day a week that there is nothing going on.

Mr. Hartwick: What do you do to provide transportation for people to get to and from the center?

Ms. Wiebner: See this is another thing that makes us a little unique, the people who come to this center are independent. They drive there. One, maybe two, use CAT Share Ride Transportation. But it's for 55 and over. So they are young.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there any way you can provide us with a copy, I need to do a little diligence with Aging to see what type of programming we can provide? I would love to

see the different programs. I was involved with the senior center in Steelton. I would like to see also the type of programming that is involved.

Ms. Wiebner: I would be glad to. Do you want newsletters maybe?

Mr. Hartwick: Maybe a daily week schedule that you breakdown the programming that you provide, from lunches to some of the outcomes that you are looking to provide with the investment of the dollars. We are really moving towards a system that we are trying to provide some real outcomes for our investment in tax dollars, Children & Youth; Mental Health/Mental Retardation; and Aging as well for the investment of our resources. What type of outcomes are we receiving in the aging community and even through our Human Services Development Funding. Actually we have new reporting standards and new outcome based measurements that is going to become a part of our investment in our dollars to show exactly the investment of the resources that we provide. How that is affecting seniors lives and how's that enabling them to stay out of other County services is certainly a way that we can measure the effectiveness of our investment. I was wondering if you keep those kinds of standards and take a look at those kind of outcomes.

Ms. Wiebner: That is another way that we work with Area Agency on Aging. We provide one of the sites for the free flu shots. We have educational speakers, seminars. We have driving classes. We have computer lab which has a waiting list. We have festivals. We have bingo. We have professional entertainment. That's another thing that a lot of centers can't provide because we have an auditorium with a stage and a sound system. So we often have professional entertainers. It's educational, it's socializing, it's the whole spectrum. But I will give you everything I can come up with.

Mr. Hartwick: Thank you.

Mr. Connor: Of the eight requests, I think Mr. Saylor said that you possibly would grant the \$15,000 for the flat roof repair. Commissioner Hartwick said we could save \$8,500 on the outdoor retaining wall.

Mr. Saylor: I would like to make a couple of quick points. When this first came to my desk shortly after I started I wasn't aware this was a County owned property. I took it to George and Edgar. They immediately began asking questions about, what we have given all this money for in the past. And one issue that came to light was that while the County makes investments in senior centers around the County, there is really no clear picture from what I have been able to see as to how this money is specifically being spent. Talking with Bob Burns and I think we had a conversation with Commissioner Hartwick about the need of increased accountability as to how these dollars are being spent by all the senior centers. What are we getting for our return? In reference to some of the questions that Commissioner Hartwick was asking. So perhaps that is an issue that we need to look forward here, what is going on at these senior centers and how are we spending those dollars, if you feel that is something you want to pursue?

George in his infinite modesty, did a very good job of detailing the money that has been going out there. I think that was a real starting point.

I think the other issue in going out to Rutherford House that we all discussed and I was out there with Edgar and then made a second trip with Carl Dickson from Fort Hunter. He was looking into some potential funding in terms of historical preservation and that kind of thing. It is clear to me that the Rutherford House, should the County decide that we want to maintain ownership of it, there is some potential—it is a diamond in the rough. I think there are some ways that if this is part of the County's mission that we could expand services out there, not only to seniors. But that huge auditorium could be used potentially for ways to generate some income for the center out there by renting it out to weddings, banquets and other things of that nature. Certainly there is room in the house itself. We have talked about the pluses and minuses of perhaps leasing out the second floor as a way to generate some income as opposed to using it for seniors to use. One of the Commissioners mentioned to me, you know we may be potentially looking for a place for historical documents, that might work as well. So I think there are a lot of questions in general about the senior centers and how to handle them but also for this facility in particular. Perhaps we need to begin figuring a way to start looking at these centers in general and this one in particular.

Specifically in this request, it is clear that the roofs are in bad shape out there. More than anything else they need to be addressed. Edgar has made some suggestions that you made Commissioner Hartwick, with regard to the retaining wall that there may be ways that we can address that without spending money. Arguments can be made for the other ones, plus and minus, but I think regardless of what we do with that place, I think the roofs need to be addressed one way or another.

Mr. Cohen: The roofs situation – the divider I think could be looked at in the 2005 budget. The retaining wall that definitely can be done through the staff or through Work Release, only purchasing materials necessary for the project. The wall itself, it is no more than three feet or four feet high. It's a little patio area. There was an elevator that was installed some time ago I think back in 2001. The elevator was installed without installing an exit way from the second floor. I don't know how that got missed. This was done I believe through the state people. Correct me if I'm wrong.

Ms. Wiebner & Mr. Connor: Correct, through a state grant.

Mr. Cohen: I don't know how that got missed. The elevator itself can take up two people barely. Three of us were on it and it couldn't take us up. Overall the building itself, it is a good building. It's a nice building. There is some water damage. There is nothing that is hazardous or nothing that is causing anybody any danger. Overall it is a good facility.

Ms. Wiebner: I would like to add one thing. When Chad was saying about where your money is being spent, every month we are required to send to the Area Agency on Aging, what is called a monthly invoice. That invoice is for the previous month and it

shows where, because we get a monthly check. We don't just get \$75,000 a year. It is divided into monthly installments. It shows where that \$6,250 was spent. But it doesn't show all of the things that we paid for, but I do have that and I'll include that with that packet to show exactly where our money is spent. We survive on the funding from the programs we do and from donations. We don't charge a membership fee because some people just can't pay that.

Mr. Cohen: As far as the marquee sign, there is a sign at the end of the facility itself. I don't see what the advantage of the marquee sign will do because the building itself does sit off the road and the sign will not actually be on the main road. Paxton Street is over so there is really no through traffic going past the building itself.

Ms. Wiebner: You can see the sign if it is placed correctly from Paxton Street. You can sit at Burger King on Paxton Street and look across the street and see the sign.

Mr. Haste: I know you can see the building from there. What are the wishes?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Are you asking for comments? As far as action, I'm not really ready to make any decisions. I guess comments, I don't have a real strong sense that since this is a County owned building, we have a firm idea of what repairs need to be done or what has been done. I may be wrong but I'm trying to get a sense. That is one thing that we need to do, is to make absolutely certain that because it is a County owned building we are involved in decisions that are being made and how the money is being spent and what money is going after, etc.

I guess the second issue that I have is, how integrated it is. Rutherford House with the Area Agency on Aging and the overall strategy of reaching out to the seniors in need primarily because you know when I look at government financing, obviously very limited government dollars have to go to those in most need. There is a difference between seniors that are mobile and have the ability to go out and get involved in things and seniors who are not mobile and do have to walk to the local church and go down to the basement because that is their area of fellowship, may be a meal or whatever. I need to better understand how we are spending that money, not just from the Rutherford House but overall strategy in the senior centers. Those are the types of issues that I'm more concerned about. In terms of specifics here, the wall, I agree with Commissioner Hartwick. We have plenty of labor and I'm sure we have enough community partners that we can find the resources to do that at a very limited cost. The roof falls again into a major capital repair and that has to go into the overall plan throughout all the County buildings when that needs to be done.

I have to agree with Edgar on the sign in that location. I don't see where a sign benefits you at all. I see where again using free media very aggressively would benefit for widespread so people can see what is going on. I can see where using the Area Agency on Aging to get the network information out also and being in contact with other golden age clubs not affiliated with the County. There is a whole senior network out

there that can be initiated that takes the message right to churches, etc. I really don't see the benefit of a sign out front. I think that is the three topics.

Mr. Hartwick: I would be glad to share my comments. From the request I see before us, usually while we have roofers out there, there is no reason why we shouldn't do spot repairs at least for the areas where there are leaks. Instead of replacing an entire roof, just while the roofers are out there, do some spot repairs to make sure that you stop where the current leaks are and try to include roof repairs in next year's CDBG budget allocation for the entire roof. From the sense of the sign and to take a look at the Area Agency on Aging resources right now, we are in a difficult position to try to make some comprehensive changes to the structure to the senior center. Next year, I think it is deserving that we take a look and repair the roof if it is in need. Tomorrow, actually I work all day in the Area Agency on Aging to find out exactly what they do and find out a little bit more about senior centers. We're also in a position to soon hopefully name a new director in the Area Agency on Aging which is going to allow us to take a comprehensive look at senior centers. It is something that I'm proud that we began now to start having meetings where the senior centers are communicating again. We would like to really develop a strong integrated plan that's going to stop any kind of bickering between the senior centers and have you all moving in the same direction with the expectations of what the state agency, as well as the county agency expects as far as outcomes for seniors in Dauphin County. We need to be specific at finding what they are. I figure you will be hearing a lot more from us as we move forward. I would only support right now the spot repairs of the roof and intend to work with Edgar and our Work Release folks to go ahead and repair that retaining wall.

Mr. Haste: Is that the \$15,000?

Mr. Hartwick: No, I would imagine spot repairs are a whole lot less than \$15,000. That's the repairing of an entire roof, I believe, is the \$15,000.

Ms. Wiebner: It has been spot repaired before.

Mr. Hartwick: This money is not in your current allocation of CDBG, am I correct in the \$50,000 that you can drawdown from 2004?

Ms. Wiebner: Right, it's shorted.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would like to get Edgar's feeling on the roof.

Mr. Hartwick: I don't like to micromanage this stuff but this deal – whatever it takes to spot repair the roof, I would give authorization to go ahead out there and do that for this year. And then next year's allocation include a brand new roof repair out of CDBG monies.

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners, maybe I can circle the staff around and come up with some proposals for you guys to consider next Wednesday?

Mr. Haste: Okay.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That seems better.

BUCHART HORN – MEL JACOBSON

1. Discuss change orders and the status of the Courthouse.

Mr. Haste: Next we have some more change orders for the Courthouse.

Mr. Jacobson: Good morning, I'm Mel Jacobson, senior architect with Bucharth Horn.

There are two change orders before you today. One is a credit for not completing the finishes in the existing elevators in the Courthouse which was designed to match the two new installed elevators which should be running Thursday afternoon or Friday. That is in the amount of \$14,900 credit.

The other change order is for the additional cost associated with the additional length of a contract for Heim Construction. That is in the amount of \$43,270.16. That was strictly overhead cost for four months. Those are the two change orders that you have.

Mr. Haste: Chad, do you want to address these?

Mr. Knupp: Mr. Chairman, I'm familiar with the Heim change order. I'm not that familiar with ThyussenKrupp. I believe Mel adequately described the fact that you're just not going to polish up those two elevators that are already existing. That's the savings there. On the \$43,270.16 that represented a negotiation where there was a \$10,000 give up by the claimant. In other words, they reduced their claim I believe about 20% over what they initially submitted. There is an adjustment to that contract of approximately \$14,000-\$15,000 which will bring the net cost to the County with respect to the change down, to about \$29,000. So the real cost of the change order is obviously \$43,000 but there is an allowance that has not been used by this contractor which reduces the net cost to the County down to about \$29,000. It is what Mel described. It is the four month extension.

Mr. Haste: Mike, is this included in your figures?

Mr. Yohe: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Once again, things get a little bit confusing. I don't want to be the one to talk about things that we already talked about twenty thousand times. What I need to know, when we talk about the reduction of the change order because of contingencies that have not been used, when we set our plan in action, was that contingency part of the money that was going to help cover the shortfall? And now is it being sort of written into some other area? This project has been the most confusing

project because of the way it is talked about. And again, I don't know what we have already accounted for and what we haven't accounted for. I do know that if we are planning on a \$90,000 contingency figure, whatever it is, to be part of how we pay for this over budget project. And now we are all of a sudden writing it off in other areas, it's not going to be there when we need it. I just need an understanding of what is going on.

Mr. Saylor: When I was first getting my hands around this project, there were three batches of change orders that had been negotiated and were sitting out there waiting for approval. One was for Costanzo, one was for Herre, and one was for Heim. These were all accounted for above and beyond the \$90,000 contingency fee. Mike has accounted for this stuff in his budget as money that was going to be spent beyond the \$90,000 contingency fee. I think the issue here is that this is the third one. Why we didn't get it through with the others, I think there was some confusion on my part and others as to how this particular one was being handled as it was not...Bob was negotiating the change order for Costanzo; he negotiated the one for Herre; and this one was handled by Brian Groce. It was a small amount, \$43,000. So that is why it is separate from the other two. This is basically why it hasn't been considered with the other two and part of the whole debate as to why this work was done. I believe at the time Brian said that this was all work that was done. He went back to the individual contractors and said I need all the work that you have been doing, that you got approval to do so that I can put it all together in one big change order and bring it to you to be considered.

Mr. Cohen: Is the County pursuing the prime contractors now since May 14 is listed as the actual finish date? I know in the contract it is May 14 for Costanzo, Heim and Herre. Did the Solicitor's office put some room in the contract?

Mr. Knupp: I think that first of all the question is two days premature. But based upon my going over to the Courthouse, the 5th floor this morning, it would appear to me that there may be some aspects of the 5th floor which may not be substantially completed by May 14. The Commissioners will recall that when you approved the Costanzo change order that you also agreed upon the recommendation of your construction manager to extend the Costanzo change order for completion time to May 31. So May 14 applies to five contractors. I'm going to say two of those contractors ThyussenKrupp and the security contractor have completed their work all together. Reynolds has to seat a toilet and fix some plumbing in one of the Judge's Chambers. That's all that they have to do yet. So that is three. Herre Brothers assured me that they have completed all of their work. That's four. You have Costanzo and I am missing one, that I can't think of. Edgar could probably help me with that. It is premature to answer Edgar's question because the bulk of the work that has yet to be done is going to be done by Costanzo from Scranton and by Novinger and other subcontractors that are employed by Costanzo. So I can't answer the question today. I can only provide you with what I learned this morning when I took about a ½ hour to see where the project is. Just basically the project is substantially completed in the Chambers, the carpeting will go down tomorrow. There is some framing work. The ceilings have been completed in

both, Judge Clark's proposed Chambers and the other Chamber is almost done. The ceiling work should be done by the end of the week in the Courtroom and the only thing that remains in the Courtroom so far as I've been told is the custom ordered paneling from E. C. Snyder Millwork Company and the paneling could not be ordered and measured until the other work was done so that the walls were in place and could be measured. Mr. Jacobson may know more than I do.

Mr. Jacobson: I think you portrayed the project very, very well.

Mr. Haste: Do we now have a new date on the Courtroom?

Mr. Knupp: No I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what the date is because I was not furnished and I do not know what the delivery date is for the paneling. That's the last of the Mohegan's. The paneling for the Courtroom is the last substantial part of the work to be done. Everything else will have been completed in my estimation and in the estimation of the person that I was with and that was not Brian, it was actually and I was pleased that Mark Crowe, the project manager from Herre, volunteered his time to take me through. That's basically what I learned this morning.

Mr. Jacobson: We know now that the ship date for the acoustical panels is the 24th. We are hoping that by the end of the month those panels will be on the job and installed or substantially complete.

Mr. Knupp: That Mr. Chairman is what we did put into the Costanzo change order. We gave Costanzo two weeks more than everybody else.

Mr. Saylor: If I could make a comment on Edgar's point, and Bob and I have talked about this, we would be in a position if any of the contractors do not meet the deadline that was given, we would have this County in a position to take in all measures to secure whatever delay damages we might be entitled to. Turn about is fair play. They've committed to a date and I'm going to be on top of that. We'll definitely be looking at that very, very closely. Buchart is going to be working with us on that.

Mr. Haste: Thank you.

BARRY WYRICK, DIRECTOR OF MH/MR

1. MH Annual Plan for FY2005/2006.

Mr. Wyrick: Thank you, Commissioners. For the record my name is Barry Wyrick, I'm the Dauphin County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Administrator. With me today is Dan Eisenhauer, the Dauphin County Mental Health Deputy Administrator.

The first thing that I would like to say, the good news about this plan is that it does not request or anticipate any increase in County funding. In FY03/04, after five years of

level County funding we approved a 5% decrease in our request for County funding. We will anticipate continuing at that decreased amount for the foreseeable future.

The Dauphin County Mental Health Program is required by the Pennsylvania Code, Title 55, Chapter 4215, to submit an annual plan for the provision of mental health services under the program's administration. The Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (who I will refer to as OMHSAS for the rest of my presentation) distributed planning guidelines for the development and presentation of the County Plan for fiscal year 2005-2006. The plan that is before you today is presented in compliance with those guidelines. This plan is the first plan submitted under planning guidelines that were drastically revised. As such, every effort has been made to understand and comply with the published guidelines, but significant areas of uncertainty remain in some areas of the guidelines. This plan seeks to provide more data to support its conclusions than in previous plans. Additionally, this plan seeks to integrate the planning for mental health services in Dauphin County with the HealthChoices program and the Harrisburg State Hospital's Service Area Plan.

The continuing difficulty in plan development is the discomfort of stakeholders and County staff in reconciling the OMHSAS requirement to submit an Annual Plan that requests new services and expanded funding when, in fact, allocations to support county-funded services were decreased in Fiscal Year 03-04, and presumably will not be increased in FY 2004-2005. Base funding for mental health services in Dauphin County has decreased in real dollars by \$97,642 since FY98-99, and has decreased by 13.77% against Consumer Price Index adjusted dollars in the same time frame. Within these financial restrictions, it is difficult to describe how to expand services and request new funding for initiatives as OMHSAS requires when the system needs significant additional financial resources just to stabilize existing services. However, planning for services is critical, and the Dauphin County Mental Health Program submits this plan to demonstrate our prioritization of services and to identify the need for additional financial resources.

There are three significant trends found in our review of community mental health system data. The first trend is the tremendous demand for services. The demand is evidenced by the data supplied by our contracted Base Service Unit, which is on pace to complete over 2,000 intakes this current fiscal year, of which about sixty five percent (65%) or more than 1,300 individuals have no prior history with our system. We will open cases for community based mental health services this fiscal year for seventy percent (70%) of consumers presenting for intake or about 1,400 consumers, approximately 900 of which will be absolutely new to our system. Please understand that in the last full year, we served 3,444 individuals, so these 900 new individuals would be an increase of 26% in one year. Dauphin County has also seen an increase in HealthChoices membership of 2,253 individuals, or 9% over the past year, while we have seen an increase in members served with behavioral health services of 991 individuals, or a 27% increase during that same time.

The second trend is an increasing lack of capacity to provide services in the community as evidenced by key data regarding the amount of time that an individual waits for hospitalization, the need to place individuals out of our area to obtain these hospitalizations, the amount of time that individuals wait in community hospitals prior to admission to the Harrisburg State Hospital, and extraordinary waiting lists for intensive services in the community. Nearly 40% of Dauphin County HealthChoices members wait for more than 4 hours for admission after CBHNP, our HealthChoices provider, approves that level of care. Our Crisis Department also reports increasing episodes where consumers wait more than 2 days in our local emergency rooms for transfer to a psychiatric unit. CBHNP reports that about 19% of inpatient admissions occur out of our five County Territory, and our Crisis department reports that data 14 % of their admissions occur out of Territory. Although Dauphin County has reduced the number of admissions to Harrisburg State Hospital this year, the average length of wait for transfer to the State Hospital has increased by five days. Dauphin County has 141 funded residential beds and a waiting list of 144 consumers for those beds as of April 7, 2004. While our supportive Living Programs are serving about 170 individuals, there is also a waiting list of 102 consumers for that service. It is clear that a decade of underfunding for mental health services has led to a crisis in lack of capacity to serve our citizens.

The third major trend is the lack of funding in proportion to the growth of demand for services and the continuing pressure to extend county-funded services by means of outreach and dedicated service development to previously underserved and unserved populations. Dauphin County is pleased to increase efforts to serve older adults, forensic populations, culturally diverse populations, sexual offenders, persons with co-occurring disorders, and persons diagnosed with mental retardation, as OMHSAS has requested that we do, but we find ourselves unable to fund services for such special populations while providing services to all required priority populations in the community and while state hospital beds caps continue to be reduced. In the Department of Public Welfare's HealthChoices Program, revenue is distributed on a per member per month basis, thereby providing some increase in revenue proportionate to growth, but County funded programs are stagnated in a level of base funding that has remained essentially the same for the past five years. No funding has been provided to either keep pace with inflation, nor to provide services to an increased number of consumers. DPW and OMHSAS continue to request that our County Program increase its collaboration with other systems and to increase our outreach to special populations, but OMHSAS provides no additional funding to our program to ensure that those outreaches can be effective. The net result is simply that each person in the community mental health system gets less service each passing year while waiting lists for critical services increase.

On a brighter note, this plan submission demonstrates the commitment of our program to the SAMHSA vision of "A Life in the Community for Everyone." This plan shows an increased emphasis in services designed to support the independent living and employment of consumers of our services and in services directed and operated by consumers. The Dauphin County Mental Health Program has communicated a vision of

transitioning the service delivery system to one that relies upon recovery and resiliency-based services. Given limitations on funding, this transition will necessitate a prioritization of funding that will include decreased support for some traditional services offered by the program. Consequently our fiscal plan must include the reduction of existing services in order to fund new initiatives or new services. The Program considers those difficult decisions based on priority and value of the service and also balanced against the need to maintain a healthy provider network of trained and adequately compensated staff that are capable of providing quality services.

The Dauphin County Mental Health Program has not sat idly by as our system has seen limited financial resources. Over the past two years, the program has demonstrated a commitment to change that better supports consumers in the community. This plan presents a continuation of the projects that have already been accomplished. Our plan is to fully embrace and train our provider network and consumers on the principles of recovery and resiliency, and to implement service system changes by using evidence based practices, and by utilizing other funding sources for assistance with housing, employment, and ancillary services. We will monitor consumer outcomes as a distinct and separate report than the requirement for provider performance measures, and we will collaborate with providers and consumers and families and stakeholders to improve the quality of the services we deliver. We plan to increase consumer operated programs such as peer to peer and peer mentoring programs that will increase consumer empowerment in our system and reduce the stigma and the effects of having a serious mental illness.

Our service system shift will be measured by increasing supportive housing services to assist consumers in finding and maintaining independent housing with on going supports, by increasing funding for employment programs, by implementing consumer driven programs and services. We will continue to partner with CBHNP, our BH-MCO, and CABHC our oversight corporation in collaborative efforts to improve and unite philosophy of care and approaches between our HealthChoices Program and our County Program. We will explore cooperative ventures with schools, children and youth, juvenile justice, early intervention, and mental retardation, drug and alcohol systems in identifying creative solutions to serving children with serious emotional disturbance, and to identify evidence based prevention programs for children and adolescents that can be implemented in our community.

Specific changes to our system planning include expanded funding for our consumer operated drop in center in late 03-04 so that our provider will be able to triple their capacity to serve consumers in the upcoming year. We have also significantly expanded our supported living provider capacity over the past two years and will continue to seek funding for such expansion. We have continued to increase funding to our employment providers in 03-04 and expect to increase that funding more in 04-05 and 05-06. Over the past two years we have collaborated with our housing authorities to develop 95 specialized housing vouchers for consumers with serious mental illness, and we continue to collaborate with them to explore and develop other grant opportunities and housing programs.

At this point we have no specific plan to cease funding certain services, but rather we are attempting to work with providers to adapt existing services to more flexible and portable community based services that can be individually tailored to meet individual consumer needs. This service system change towards increased independent living and consumer empowerment is the primary method we can identify to reduce the long waiting lists for our residential services, but we are unable to make abrupt and wholesale changes to our residential programming while the demand for all services remains as high as it is.

We will continue our collaborative funding ventures such as co-funding a CHIPP program with Cumberland /Perry MH/MR which began in FY 01/02 and continues, our MH and MR funded CHIPP, our co – funding of our Community Treatment Team with CBHNP. In addition we will continue to seek other revenue sources, including SAMHSA grants, SSA Grants, HUD grants, PATH grants and local grants. Over the past two years we have been awarded a SAMSHA grant, an OMHSAS grant for transition aged youth and young adults, a Greater Harrisburg Foundation Grant, a Human Service Development Fund grant, and were partners in being awarded a HUD Shelter plus Care grant. We will continue all such strategies to maximize our funding and make improvements to our service system.

This plan presents an accurate picture of the level of funding that is necessary to accomplish these strategies. In our current fiscal year, the county budget for mental health services was approximately 13 million dollars, and the total allocation for Dauphin County for HealthChoices will be just over 33 million dollars. While the growth in revenues for HealthChoices for the 05-06 plan year will be dependent on state established rates and membership numbers, we do anticipate an approximate increase of about 10% for 05-06, or an additional 3.3 million dollars in HealthChoices funds. However, to fully fund the county only portion of this plan would require doubling of our current county mental health allocation, to approximately 26 million dollars. While this number seems dramatic, it is the product of a decade of under funded services and a rising demand for services that has not been recognized by the state. While we do not anticipate that the presentation of these budget numbers will lead to any increase in our state allocation, since the mental health program does not have a needs based budgeting process, we believe that it is critical to demonstrate to the state the actual cost of repairing a mental health system that the President's New Freedom Commission described as fundamentally broken.

We extend our appreciation to the Dauphin County MH/MR Advisory Board, members of planning groups, provider agencies, consumers, family members and advocates for their input and involvement in the planning process. The success that the Dauphin County Mental Health Program has experienced in the past is due to the combined efforts of those who are committed to supporting persons with mental disabilities. We present this plan and recommend its adoption by the Commissioners. I welcome any questions that you may have.

Mr. Haste: The new services total \$1.9 million. Where do you anticipate getting those funds from?

Mr. Wyrick: This is a proposal for new services. These new services would be implemented only in a situation if the state would supply the funding for them.

Mr. Haste: What is a Jeremy project?

Mr. Wyrick: It is a state grant designated to facilitate the transition of children that are in the mental health system into the responsibility of adulthood and also services provided by the adult system. The two systems are very, very different in the delivery of services.

This is a demonstration project to the State that shows that transition can be facilitated. We believe that it has been very successful in the first two years.

Mr. Haste: On page 14, Harrisburg State Hospital Service Area Plan Goals, are they your goals or are those Harrisburg Hospital's goals or are they State goals?

Mr. Wyrick: Those are State goals. We disagree Bohemically with the goals and they were delivered from on high by the State.

Mr. Haste: I feel much better that you said that. I don't agree with those goals at all. All that is, quite frankly the way I view that, and I understand the rationale behind it – all that is, is a shift of these folks from your system to another system that is even worse for them.

Mr. Wyrick: Actually they try to address that in goal number 3 where they say we are actually going to incarcerate fewer of the target population.

Mr. Haste: There is no way that will happen!

Mr. Wyrick: There is no way that will happen without doubling the State's commitment to mental health services. You are exactly right.

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Wyrick: And we really don't foresee that.

Mr. Haste: This is their plan and this is their goal and we think it is bunk; why is it part of our plan?

Mr. Wyrick: We are required to address those three goals in our plan.

Mr. Haste: I think some how we need to put a note to them and say, that we feel strongly that this can only be accomplished by the proper funding. And quite frankly if the State doesn't live up to that....

Mr. Wyrick: In the text of our plan, that is clearly stated in the County portion. It is also clearly stated in the service area plan portion that says these goals can only be met with the level of funding that we present which is twice as much of what we are getting now.

Mr. Haste: This is crap! You can tell them I said that.

Mr. Wyrick: I would love to have you tell Joe Nery, our Deputy Secretary.

Mr. Haste: I would be happy to tell him that.

Mr. Wyrick: That is where they came from.

Mr. Haste: Because being oversight of the Prison and seeing what is going on out there, this is nothing but a cop out by the State. They've done it ever since they started scaling back the state hospital systems. It saves them money and all they are doing is they put the people in a facility like DCP or they stay out on the street where they cause more harm. We're not helping anybody in this process other than those folks who want to feel good about saying that they've done something. They've not done a thing!

Mr. Hartwick: That is why you see crisis numbers jump also significantly.

Mr. Haste: If I have to sign this Plan, I want a note put in there that I don't agree with it because it is crap!

Mr. Eisenhower: Basically what it looks like and again, that's part of the purpose for the area is that we can incorporate changes.

Mr. Wyrick: On page 28, section 8, the table of contents is right behind the cover sheet. If you follow that table of contents you'll see that attachment I Item #10 is in fact the service area plan. But the State just requires us and so then on page 28 Dauphin County is to submit our overview of the service area plan and that is the section in which we would insert the Board of Commissioners comments specifically (objections) to the goals established by the State.

Mr. Haste: They are unrealistic the way they have it set up there. All this is, is a shift of people in the MH/MR system where they should be to the criminal justice system. Whether they want to acknowledge and admit that, that is the fact of the matter. That's all they have done. Then you put them in a facility but we can't use any of those dollars to help these people. All they are going to do by doing this is compound that problem. I strongly object to that!

Mr. Wyrick: What I can do is revise this section and send it to you separately for your review.

Mr. Haste: That's my feeling on that part of it.

Mr. Wyrick: I would be perfectly happy to include the Commissioner's comments.

Mr. Haste: Thanks.

Mr. Wyrick: To have the support of the Commissioners in our objections to the State planning process is very important to me as the Administrator.

Mr. Haste: We shouldn't roll over for them.

Mr. Wyrick: This has been a very difficult two years in trying to administer increased demands that the State is delivering to us while they are at the same time decreasing our funding. We are finding ourselves at a crisis of the breaking point.

Mr. Haste: As you are going through your lack of capacities, 1,2,3, I see where you are trying to address those back in the new services things but if they don't fund it and they don't do it, this whole document is meaningless.

Mr. Wyrick: It has been a meaningless process for more than ten years. It's part of our frustration that we present to the State what our needs are. It has no impact on how much funding they actually provide to the counties unlike the Children & Youth Plan which is needs based. When they were talking with the counties about their visions to the Planning Guidelines, my advocacy position was the only way that you will get me to play along with these plan guidelines and helping you develop good ones, is if you can tie dollars to the planning process. When they initiated the planning changes, they were making that commitment; however, two months later the State removed the commitment to tie dollars to the planning process.

Mr. Hartwick: Barry, could you do an analysis if we were to implement the State Hospital Goals what the impact of that would be to Dauphin County's prison system and to the remainder of what the County support of Mental Health?

Mr. Wyrick: If the State provided us the funds that we asked for to implement this and the service area plan, I believe that we would be able to successfully implement a combined mental health and mental health forensic strategy that could actually decrease the number of mentally ill individuals that are currently in Dauphin County Prison. If they fund us.

Mr. Haste: You need to have the facilities and you need to have the programs to do that! They are going the other way!

Mr. Wyrick: If however, they decrease the size of the State Hospital and implement the first goal which no one is hospitalized there for more than two years without providing us the necessary level of funding, it will break our system, the mental health system. We currently have people who wait 60 days in a community hospital to get transferred to the State Hospital. They are talking about decreasing by more than half our state hospital

capacity. That would just – we would be unable to function if they require these goals without the funds necessary.

Mr. Hartwick: But they hold the checkbook and they can implement these goals without providing the funds. How are we going to proactively position ourselves to make this issue known to the public and not accept another unfunded state requirement?

Mr. Wyrick: I'm known by the State to be one of their pains. With the will and support of the Commissioners, I can draw the line with the State to say, no! We will not. A good example of that line was we are participating in a State Hospital transition project this year where we are moving four individuals out of the State Hospital into the community at the cost of losing two beds at the State Hospital permanently. It's the first time that it hasn't been bed for bed. In other words in previous years it would have cost us four beds. We presented a budget for moving those four individuals to the State and the State came back and said, no we can't fund your budget. This is the amount of money you are going to get from us to move these four individuals. That was true with all of the counties in the service area for the Harrisburg State Hospital. I was the only Administrator who went back to the State and said absolutely not. I will not accept the amount of funding that you are posing to me. I proposed a compromise position and we negotiated a settlement. But it required the State to do things that they weren't used to doing in order to do that.

Mr. Haste: If we don't provide these services, doesn't it fall back to the State to find someone else to do that? We are acting as their agent.

Mr. Wyrick: Legislation actually makes it a County responsibility. It makes it the County's MH/MR Administrator's responsibility.

Mr. Haste: Well then why don't they let us do it the way we want to do it?

Mr. Wyrick: I can't answer that.

Mr. Haste: Every Tuesday morning I spend at the Prison and go through things. Yesterday and this is ironic that this came up, I didn't know this was coming up. I sat and went through all kinds of things, incident reports, and then I go through medical reports. Yesterday, I want to say from April 13th to last Friday, during that timeframe, there were over 70 what is called low bed restrictions issued by doctors. That's not even taking into account the fifteen minute watches that are on out there. We are getting ourselves into a situation and what that means for people who don't understand, that means that person has an issue or a problem with some mental health stability where it is a safety issue that they must be kept on a low bunk and can't be put on a higher bunk. We're getting to the point where we have bed space but we don't have the appropriate bed space. We are going to soon have to, and may soon be at the point, where we have to buy special mattresses with pillows already in the mattresses because of the nature of the people we are getting there and the issues. It's getting to the point where it is not the space issue, it's the type of space that we have. When you

start looking at that in numbers, 75 in about a 3 ½ week period of time that means it is 75 people that came in with some issue that required a physician or psychiatrist to say there is a safety issue here. That's another side affect of stuff like this. It's not going to get any better. And it is not the right environment for these type of people. The other problem we have and we have talked about this, since they are incarcerated, your system has to walk away from them. You have people who are guards and you have some physicians, but you also have some people who this isn't their business to be asked by the State and everybody else to take care of these folks. It usually is not a good mix. When these people refuse to take their medications, bad things happen to themselves and to others. It is a growing problem out there.

Mr. Wyrick: Part of the service area plan does propose major funding for forensic both intervention prior to sentencing and then building facilities so that inmates can be transitioned out of the Prison into those facilities.

Mr. Haste: We don't have those facilities!

Mr. Wyrick: No, we don't now. This plan proposes major funding for those things.

Mr. Hartwick: We are talking specifically about mental health/prison that keeps people there that have committed crimes. They are a danger and threat to themselves and to others. They've been convicted of something but they want to receive specialized treatment that they wouldn't otherwise get in the prison.

Mr. Wyrick: Due to the State financing issue that Commissioner Haste pointed out...

Mr. Haste: You can't refer to it as prison incarcerated?

Mr. Wyrick: The individuals in those would have to be on probation status not as sentenced inmate status. We have individuals at Dauphin County Prison right now that the judges are willing to transition to probation status when we have space in a facility. I just don't have space in a facility. This plan proposes greatly increasing our resources.

Mr. Haste: In your five county collaborative that we have.....

Mr. Wyrick: For Health Choices, yes.

Mr. Haste: Could there be a discussion of a regional facility for this....call it whatever you want to? Quite frankly all it is, is a local run hospital that the State should be doing and they are not doing. Is there any discussion among the members, because we can't be the only place that has this problem?

Mr. Wyrick: The Health Choices Collaborative, that is not a required nor funded service under Health Choices Residential Services for adults. It is not funded under Health Choices.

Mr. Haste: I know but since you already have that relationship in that coalition, is there a way to start talking with them about doing a regional facility or a way to deal with this on a regional basis?

Mr. Wyrick: Absolutely.

Mr. Haste: Even though it is not part of that but you already have the infrastructure.

Mr. Wyrick: The service area plan includes some of those same counties and some other counties. The service area includes York, Adams, Cumberland, Perry, Franklin, Fulton, and Dauphin counties. The forensic facilities that are addressed in the service area plan are presented as regional facilities.

Mr. Haste: We keep talking about the Prison overcrowding and we need to do something there. I would much rather look at this approach as opposed to building more cell space. I think it won't go away. It's the wrong way to deal with these people.

Mr. Hartwick: As we took a look at the task force for two possible solutions, one was to try to find a facility to deal specifically with mental health patients and one specifically for females. That ought to be separate and be able to give individualized treatment in the hopes of getting them through and out of our main prison system.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In commenting in the infinite wisdom of government, we ironically have a very competent good regional facility right now which would be the State Hospital that they are trying to push people out of so that we can find a way to build an original facility and put people back into it. I truly believe that we need to take whatever steps necessary again and make this one of our legislative initiative items. Not only should you be the thorn in the State's side, the Board should be the thorn in the State's side. We should carry this issue and we should make people's lives very uncomfortable when they issue a policy that is counter productive, that is short-sighted that lacks vision and is quite frankly not good for the public. We should be there to say, no, we are not going to put up with this. And we should take them on. And the threat is to pull the funding. They want to get into a public battle, we'll get into a public battle and if they want to get into a political battle we can do that, too.

Mr. Wyrick: Commissioners, I appreciate your support.

Mr. Saylor: Given where this is going, I have an idea that perhaps we extend an invitation to DPW to come to a Workshop and maybe answer some questions from the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Haste: Yes, they like to have us up there. That wouldn't be bad to order them here.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That's a great idea.

Mr. Haste: Actually if we are going to do it, let's do it in the evening as a public hearing so we can get lots of folks here.

Mr. Saylor: Outside of the regular scheduled meetings?

Mr. Haste: Work with Barry. Let's put this together. Also, if we're going to do this let's talk to Betsy at the Prison. This problem falls under her realm out there.

Mr. Hartwick: We should clearly adopt a position as well and have it well thought out and structured before this. We'll talk about how we're going to do that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think one of the benefits for the record, is that a lot of comments can be summarized in a resolution that can be drafted by staff but it is pretty much written on the comments I think that have been made.

Mr. Haste: You then will make note in your Plan?

Mr. Wyrick: We will make a revision on page 28 of the actual plan document and our reaction to the service area plan indicating the Commissioners reservations.

Mr. Haste: I assume this goes with a cover letter when you send it to the State?

Mr. Wyrick: It can. What the State requests is that the Commissioners sign that page.

Mr. Haste: Let's do it with a strongly worded cover letter.

Mr. Wyrick: That would be fine. Would you prepare the cover letter or do you want me to prepare a draft?

Mr. Haste: You can go ahead and prepare a draft. You know the issue better than I do. Is there anything else?

Mr. DiFrancesco: From a housekeeping perspective, I saw that you had your comments prepared. I don't know if normally there is a request made in the electronic format but it would probably help the folks in the back of the room if you could get that to them. It would save them a lot of aggravation to having to retype at least those formal comments that you made.

Mr. Wyrick: Who should I send that to?

Mr. Haste: Jul.

Mr. Wyrick: Yes, I have that electronically.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Very good, thank you.

Mr. Haste: Is there anything else? (There was none)

ANDREW GIORGIONE, ESQ.

1. Amendment to the Original CAP Confirmation between The Harrisburg Authority, City of Harrisburg, the County of Dauphin, and the Royal Bank of Canada to allow for conversion of the management of the CAP Transaction from the bond market municipal swap index to an index based on 68% of LIBOR for the purposes of generating CAP management savings to be deposited into the 2003D Sub-account on the Retrofit Construction Account in the Construction Fund created under the Indenture.

Mr. Giorgione: Commissioners you have before you an agreement for your consideration. It has been drafted as an Acknowledge Agreement to provide a change in the manner in which the cap is being managed in the Resource Recovery Financing.

When we did the financing back in December, the County, the Authority, and the City entered into a qualified interest rate management agreement that provided for management of certain aspects of financing related to the swap and the cap. If you will recall, we did a variable rate deal but put a ceiling on the interest rate. What we did was we basically purchased a cap for essentially the life of the bonds. That is being managed in a certain manner under that qualified interest rate management agreement and we found a better and cheaper way to manage it which will provide a cost savings which money will be rebated back to the Authority. Currently, we are estimating the savings to be somewhere around \$1.1 million. The money will be placed in the 2003 D construction fund to be used for the project. We discussed that a little bit earlier. At the close of the project if those funds are still remaining, it would then roll over into one of the different funds that we created as backup of the operation of the facility itself once it is operating. Lou Verdelli is with me and he can probably give you a little more meat on the bones as it relates to the change from the current management system to the new one.

Mr. Haste: I don't believe the Board has anything in front of them. We do have a summary.

Mr. Giorgione: I provided it to Chad several months ago after the City and the Authority signed it. I apologize I didn't even bring copies myself this morning.

Mr. Haste: I think we know what you're talking about.

Mr. Giorgione: The agreement is only a few pages. Essentially all it provides in the operative provisions is that the Authority agrees that the net proceeds received from the bank, with respect to the amendment, be deposited in a 2003 D Sub-account of the retrofit construction account in the construction fund and shall be applied to pay cost of the retrofit. The City agrees that the City SWAP guarantee is not affected by the amendment and remains in full force and effect. Then it says that the County agrees that the County SWAP guarantee is not affected by the amendment and remains in full

force and effect. That's it. Then there is a long background on the status of the project, when it was financed and how it is being managed.

Mr. Hartwick: I have one question and I think you addressed it, that it can't be used for any other purpose but the retrofit construction.

Mr. Giorgione: Right. Right now it will go right into that construction fund sub-account. It will be used for the retrofit project then pursuant to the various, I mean there are several levels of operating funds. Any money left over has to be rolled over into those funds and then it will sit there.

Mr. Haste: To certain capacities.

Mr. Giorgione: I think the second fund is \$20 million. You need that \$20 million....and those funds would come before the City guarantee and they would also come before the County guarantee, operating revenue, reserve fund, debt service reserve fund, City guarantee and County guarantee.

Mr. Verdelli: Since we were the County's financial adviser to review this transaction back in December, I just wanted to make sure that you are all clear that there is a potential impact to the County. A lot of odd things would have to happen but this does increase the risk of the amount that the County could be on the hook for under again some odd scenarios occurring. But I want to make sure that you are clear on that. I'll briefly describe it so you can picture it. As Andy mentioned the debt on the incinerator actually is a variable rate. It resets every week off of an index called the Bond Market Association Index. That's a group of tax exempt variable rates. So they are moving along and the cap that was originally purchased said that if the BMA Index ever hits 6% it would kick in and the counter party would make payments instead of the project having to make payments above 6%. What's being proposed is to kind of disconnect that cap from that BMA Index which again is tax exempt and these are tax exempt bonds, but use a cap that is a percent of a taxable index. Going to a different index taking a percent of that which is hopefully going to mirror where a tax exempt rate would be, but you do have this disconnect. So you pick up two risks. The first basis which is any time you have some index rate with a cap above it that they are not plugged into the same index you have basis risks that they wouldn't always move together. These two indexes, this is just going back to 1990, they stayed real close most of the time but again sometimes one line is above the other and you could at some point find a situation. Actually back in 1990 was a situation where BMA which would be the rate on these bonds was at just above 6% but the same percent of this taxable rate would not have produced 6%. So in that scenario if the rates were at 6¼% the project would actually have to pay that extra ¼% if the other index hadn't reached it.

Mr. Haste: For the time from that, they're separated?

Mr. Verdelli: At any time, right. Obviously, how this impacts you, is way down the line if it ever got to that situation. Just so you understand that. The other risk is a tax risk that

we are using an index to pay the variable rate bonds which I mentioned is a tax exempt rate. You know that you issue tax exempt debt at a lower cost because people that buy that debt don't have to pay taxes on the interest they earn. If the federal government were to cut federal tax rates and reduce them, that index of tax exempt bonds will adjust because people won't get as much benefit from owning a tax exempt bond and you would see some adjustment. Just like we saw those indexes move apart when Steve Forbes was a candidate for President proposing a flat tax that was going to have a major impact on municipal bond rates. So if we ever thought that federal tax rates were going to go down to 10%, it would greatly jeopardize this relationship. So everybody is comfortable taking that tax risk but we just need to point it out that what you're picking up and basically the reason this insurance policy now costs a little bit less over the next thirty years is because there is a little bit more risk. Because it costs less, we're getting that savings up front. But it is important that you understand it does slightly increase the risk profile of that financing.

Mr. Haste: The index was 100% of the tax or is this the 68% of the taxable? The percentage difference gives you a little bit of an edge.

Mr. Verdelli: Right. If federal taxes went to zero, those two should be exactly the same at 6% because we are taking 68% to calculate our formula, at that point in time it would be at 4% and if you actually had to pay 6% the cap would be 200 basis points away from even kicking in. So it would be useless if federal tax rates went to zero obviously. We don't see that happening anytime soon.

Mr. Haste: There are a lot of other positives.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Why are we doing this now? What is the motivation? Is it the fact we didn't know it before? Is it a fact that something, why would we choose to take on more risk on a plan that was just recently passed and we accepted a certain level of risk supposedly well thought out? What is the reason for change?

Mr. Verdelli: The Authority's financing team had put together that package where the rate and the cap were matched on the same index. I think after the project and there pulling it altogether back in December there was a lot going on. I think after the fact they realized there was a cheaper way to somewhat provide the same protections than the BMA cap. Because the BMA cap is really safe and it is obviously a little bit more expensive. So I think further down the line they were pricing the differential. The other thing is that cap is kind of rare. I was talking to some of the people in our SWAP group saying that the BMA cap is very rare. Most of the market uses the percent LIBOR which is the taxable rate. Again that's why it is a lot, pricing wise, cheaper to use that because it is a more widely accepted instrument. At the time, they were just trying to get everything to line up and then later on when they found it was more cost savings to use the other alternative which was a couple of months they went back to the Authority and then the Authority started this process of getting everyone's approvals.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Again, this only kicks in if the County taxing authority comes into call?

Mr. Verdelli: No, this cap will kick in hopefully before anyone else. It would only impact you if it has gotten through the revenues are short, the reserve funds are short, the City doesn't make the payment and now it's up to you.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In actuality what we are doing is, we're getting a refund. It is going back to the project getting us stronger revenue position.

Mr. Haste: You are enabling the fund to be in a better position at the start.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We may actually be stronger by assuming more risk especially if the trend continues that you mentioned earlier about a lot of things coming in under budget and more money being set aside.

Mr. Haste: Especially if the risk or the down turn occurs later in the project. The more you get upfront the more cushion you build to withstand any downside that you have.

Mr. Giorgione: It is important to note too when we were putting this financing together we talked about variable rate debt and fixed rate debt, we didn't even have to purchase a cap. I think we decided to do it as an insurance policy. We essentially bought one insurance policy and now we're buying a different one. But if you look at it historically, you can correct me, as I understand it the variable rate debt has not been over for probably about 15+ years. I don't think it has been over 3½% or it has averaged 3 ½%. Right now it's been under 1% for the first five or six months. We're enjoying a lot of savings from it.

Mr. Haste: The longer that stays that way the better off we are because the economy will take a turn. The more we can build that up now the better off we will be when that happens.

Mr. Verdelli: It is a thirty year financing.

Mr. Haste: It will happen. The more we can build those reserves now the better off you're going to be able to withstand that.

Do we need to take action today?

Mr. Gorgione: We don't need to. The Authority and the City signed off on this document back in March. At one point, a few weeks back, the savings were close to \$1.3 million. The market is moving a little bit. If you want to do it next week, I'm sure that is fine. But if you could do it today, we can at least have it behind us.

Mr. Haste: Is there any objection to doing it today?

Mr. Verdelli: No Sir.

Mr. Haste: Is everybody comfortable with doing it today?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'll make a motion.

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve an Amendment to the Original CAP Confirmation between The Harrisburg Authority, City of Harrisburg, the County of Dauphin, and the Royal Bank of Canada to allow for conversion of the management of the CAP Transaction from the bond market municipal swap index to an index based on 68% of LIBOR for the purposes of generating CAP management savings to be deposited into the 2003D Sub-Account on the Retrofit Construction Account in the Construction Fund created under the Indenture.

Mr. Smida: One note, the Acknowledge Agreement I believe that you have in front of you is undated, we will work with Bond Counsel to modify it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So we shouldn't actually sign this copy.

Mr. Smida: It will actually be a date in May.

Mr. Gorgione: You can sign that one and we will just replace the cover page with a May date.

Mr. Haste: All those in favor, say aye.

All: Aye.

Mr. Haste: Motion carries.

Mr. Verdelli: If I may, just a quick update on the refinancing project that still is not finished as the settlement date is approaching. I reported to you that on the first set of escrow securities we're able to save about \$100,000 on the purchase. The other set we've been fortunate that interest rates have been rising so that we have been able to trade those securities several times. That's produced an additional reduction in the cost of those securities of \$200,000. So where we are right now, the total restructuring project is \$300,000 less of a cost impact than what was presented the day of the bond sale. Obviously, once we get to settlement which is just a week away, we'll have a total final number that we can give to Mike Yohe to report. So far the impact of that debt restructuring is down \$300,000 from what we reported.

Mr. Haste: Thank you very much.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- A. Change Order No. 11 with Alexander Constructors, Inc. in an add amount of \$18,135.00 for the Dauphin Manor renovations project. This has been discussed at a Workshop and Commissioners' Legislative Meeting – there

is money in the budget. (*****A VOTE IS REQUESTED 5/12/05**)

- B. Resolution authorizing a banking relationship with Commerce Bank.
- C. Recyclable Materials Disposal Agreement between Dauphin County Solid Waste Management & Recycling and Newark Group, Inc.
- D. Municipal Recycling Program Grant Agreement between Dauphin County Solid Waste Management & Recycling and the PA Dept. of Environmental Protection.

Mr. Haste: Change Order No. 11 with Alexander Constructions for Spring Creek.

Mr. Saylor: That went through a Workshop. We held it off so we are now ready to move on it unless you guys have additional questions.

Mr. Haste: This is the one they came in and spoke to us about, right?

Mr. Saylor: Right.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to approve Change Order No. 11 with Alexander Constructors, Inc., in an add amount of \$18,135.00 for the Dauphin Manor renovations project; motion carries.

Mr. Haste: Since Kelly is here, would you address Item C & D? Just give the Board an update on what those are. We will take action next week.

Ms. Wolf: The Recyclable Materials Agreement between our department, the County, and Newark Group is for the sale of the newspapers and magazines collected from the drop off depots. Currently, we are not getting paid for that material because the local processors that we were using didn't have room for us. The other processor was in Reading. It was not economical for us to transport it there. They were only going to give us maybe \$5.00 a ton. So it didn't work out. In the interim, I have been corresponding with the Newark Group. They are from Newark, New Jersey. They own a mill in York. They have sampled some of our roads of newspaper and they are willing to give us \$30.00 a ton. Newspaper is the most collected commodity that we have. We recycled close to 200 tons already this year.

The Municipal Recycling Program Grant Agreement between Dauphin County and DEP is for the \$198,000 a 902 Grant, as they call it and the money is allocated for education and the other half of our collection vehicle, which would be a third collection vehicle. We already paid for and have been reimbursed for the collection unit. Now we just have to purchase the actual chaises.

Mr. Haste: Any questions for Kelly?

Mr. DiFrancesco: On a different subject, did you get any word back from your letter on Lower Swatara Township with regards to the airport?

Ms. Wolf: No I did not.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm interested in staying up on that. Let me know if you need me to get involved.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Vance: There are a number of different contacts and agreements which we will be reviewing and hopefully will be in proper point to present next week. The Banking Resolution based upon our review in our workshop meeting the other day, appears that needs to be substantially revised to bring it into compliance with Section 1762 of the County Code. They just used a generic form. We'll prepare a revised version and transmit it to the Bank presumably they'll need to have it to discuss with their people.

Mr. Hartwick: Chad could you get me a copy of #6, 9, & 13? It would be helpful.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. DiFrancesco: I believe all of us received a copy from CCAP on two proposed bills moving through the Senate. I don't know that we've ever taken action as a Board behind any Legislative initiatives but CCAP is warning that these two proposals have some language in them that may cause some financial burden on the counties going forward. I'm going to take a look at both those policies and figure out what it is specifically that they are addressing and try to get back to each of you with some sort of report unless somebody else has done that. I know as a Board we set a goal of being more actively involved. I'll follow up on that.

Mr. Hartwick: I have a few comments but I'll reserve them for next week. There is one thing I want to make sure for part of the record today was the regrets that we lost one of our very good and our own Hattie Banks who passed away. She was from the Personnel Department. She was a stalwart in Dauphin County. A lot of us gotten to know her in a short time but no matter how long you have known her, it was like you had known her your whole life. She was certainly a great asset and a great person of the County. She will be sorely missed.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: We are again at the point of public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board?

Mr. Saylor: I would.

Mr. Haste: The Chief Clerk's Report needs to be on the agendas from now on.

Mr. Saylor: I have three points that I would like to draw to your attention. One is that this weekend is Wetlands Weekend at Wildwood Lake Sanctuary. Special activities are planned. Fort Hunter is dedicating the Leadership Walk, at 11:30 a.m. on Monday to honor past and future benefactors of Fort Hunter. Next Wednesday, I noticed Fort Hunter is also hosting a Civil War Lecture which is free to the public. Finally, we need to extend some kudos on the E-Cycling Event which took place May 1st at HACC. It was a huge success. We got some good press. I guess we are still waiting final totals. I have an estimated 600 cars showed up to deposit their electronics. I want to extend kudos to Kelly obviously and the recycling porpoise.

Mr. Haste: Billy, the Bottle-nosed Dolphin.

Mr. Saylor: Monday morning DCED is hosting a breakfast. Emily White will be presenting the Governor's proposals for Economic Development.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I will not be able to be there. Monday mornings are at Spring Creek.

Mr. Haste: Is there anything else for the Board? (There was none).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to adjourn?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste to adjourn the meeting; motion carries.

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk
May 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff
printed 7/28/04