



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

June 22, 2005
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Robert Dick, Treasurer; Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Dave Schreiber, Personnel Office; Kay Sinner, Personnel Office; Melanie McCaffrey, Solicitor's Office; Diane McNaughton, Commissioners' Office; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Robb Wentzel, Director of EMA; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Elke Moyer, Human Services Director's Office; Eileen Carson, Area Agency on Aging; Dan Robinson, Director of Community and Economic Development; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget; Dave Murdoch, DEMA; Jack Harlacker, DEMA; Bob Christoff, Conservation District; Mike Pries, Director of Safety & Security; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office and Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office

GUESTS PRESENT

Jack Sherzer, Steve Shaver, Mike Zellhart, Matt Bonanno, Todd Gilanit, Rick Pickles, John McCready, Kurt Braun, Don Konkle, John Brabits, Kevin McGeary, Mike Corcorin, and Pete Shelly

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 six sets of Meeting Minutes that we will take up at next week's meeting. They are here for the Board to review.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: At this point in time, we will move to public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board at this time? (There were none.)

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Mike Yohe, Budget Director

Update on bank RFP's

Mr. Yohe: About a month ago, you tasked me with sending out an RFP for our investment account to various banks. We had two other banks. We had been using all along Commerce Bank, Community Banks and Sovereign Bank. Citizens Bank and PNC approached with similar account proposals and at that time you had asked me to send out an RFP to actually narrow it down to three again. They were due June 10th. They were all back in time. As you can see at the top of this form I listed pretty much the criteria on the left that was in the RFP. A "yes" means they met the criteria. "No" obviously means they didn't. The second part of it is what they actually quoted for the six month period. The RFP is to identify three banks that will house our investable funds for the period July through December. Each of the three banks on a monthly basis will have the opportunity then to bid, if one of them wants to get more aggressive in trying to get a bigger piece of the action. The highest bidder each month will get 50% of the funds. The other two will split the remaining 50%. As you see the second part is what they each quoted. I knew this was going to be a little bit difficult because they weren't all going to quote the same things. It is going to be hard to compare; apples to apples if you will. I had each of them then submit an estimate. I gave them estimated balances for each of the months, average cash balances for each of the months and

had them then estimate a rate of return and an actual interest earnings amount, which you will see on the third section down. The long story short, the results came back at the very bottom. The highest one clearly was Sovereign, because they are offering a fixed rate of 3.64%, which is well above what we are getting. That may not be high by October or November, but right now I like the fact that we can get 3.64% immediately on our funds. PNC was clearly the lowest, because three of the banks indexed their rate to the Fed Fund rate. Two of them added points to the Fed Fund rate. PNC subtracted points from the Fed Fund rate. That pretty much put them at #5 out of the 5. Community Banks clearly beat Citizens Bank, because they both indexed the Fed Fund rate, where Community added 22 and Citizens added 15 so that put Community Banks in the mix. I was left with comparing Citizens Bank's Fed Fund rate index with Commerce Bank's 91-day Treasury Bill rate index. We have been using Commerce Bank the last several months, the highest one that we have been using, I checked with M&T and Mr. Morris provided me, before he left, with some historical comparisons of various indexes and then I also checked with PFM, as our financial consultants. Given these two options, I didn't tell them who it was, who would you pick? They checked with three of their experts in that area and they all picked the 91-day Treasury Bill rate plus 30 basis points in a rising interest rate environment. I liked the fact that it was different. If we pick Sovereign, Community Banks and Commerce, we have three different bases for our funds. We will have a good diversification there. In the overall rankings, we came up with Sovereign as #1, Commerce Bank as #2 and Community Banks as #3, which are coincidentally the same three that we are using now. That is my evaluation of the RFP's and I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Haste: Can you explain that bottom chart? If that is your ranking on your interest earnings then why don't they follow that way?

Mr. Yohe: The interest earnings are as provided by the banks and that is simply their guess as to where the interest rates are going. I just wanted to see what each one was anticipating. I told them outright that I was not going to base the rankings on that, but I wanted to see what their thoughts are on where they think the interest rates are going in the next six months.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I want to make a request prior to next week's meeting. Could you give me a chart with the history of these rates over time, over lapse, over trend? Obviously some of the banks on this chart we have had concerns with in recent weeks with them all of a sudden dropping back. I know that since most of these rates float I want to know that the picture of the snapshot that we have on this piece of paper follows the trend that shows that they are higher than the others. I would like to see a trend of history just to make sure that these rates, depending on how they decide their rate, in fact do track at a higher level and we are getting the best rate and tomorrow it is not going to drop down to be the low number.

Mr. Yohe: Okay.

Mr. Hartwick: Obviously the concern that we had was with the last bank that is listed. They continually dropped out of the mix and now they happen to be the highest one with the bid. We don't want people to push their numbers up to try to get the business and then in fact not deliver for the next six months with those particular rates. I agree with Nick as well.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We are buying into a variable rate basically and on one day it may look really good and on another day it may look really bad. My concern is what is the average and I want to see that tracked over time. If we can get some sort of a graph or chart that basically lays them out so we can see very clearly over time what it would mean to the County.

Mr. Yohe: I have that.

Mr. Hartwick: One other thing that I want to make sure doesn't happen too is that banks start to come in and say we didn't mean to include this, we want to submit another proposal. You guys are misunderstanding the proposal. What they submit is what they submit. I don't want anyone to start playing games with trying to readjust the basis of how they are providing their numbers. Keep the numbers that we have and do that analysis and not by anyone contacting you and saying that is not what I really meant in my proposal. Let me put us back in the mix.

Mr. Yohe: I have already talked to both PNC and Citizens. They both were called and quite frankly I said PNC is the lowest and there is no way around that. Citizens, I think we are weighing between you and this other bank and they called me back and I said that it doesn't look too good, but the Commissioners have the ultimate decision to make. The only thing I will say to Commissioner DiFrancesco's comment is my recommendation would be to go with their fixed rate of 3.64%. That would not be floating. What Sovereign did, they put a little pressure on in their proposal that this rate was only good through June 15th. I told them that was not going to work. Tentatively right now the rate is good through June 23rd. I can let him know that the Commissioners have not voted. We are leaning toward you being #1, but if you are going to force us into this that may change things. My thought is that in July I will hold them to what they bid. That will be their rate for July. Starting with August I am going to have to throw it out there if one of them wants to raise their rates up again to get more of the action.

Mr. Haste: That was still the whole idea that we will use the three, competing for four pieces. Everyone will get a third and the highest bidder that month gets the fourth piece.

Mr. Yohe: If you read the RFP's you can gather by looking at them that these are their bids for the six month term, even though I said that this will be ongoing. I think for July we should just go with what we have here as their July bid.

Mr. Hartwick: You give a good political answer for Sovereign on no minimum balance requirements, yes and no, what does that mean?

Mr. Yohe: As long as we keep the balance at \$5 million, these rates are good. All the scenarios we have, the lowest is about \$11 million. They threw that in there, but it really isn't a consideration in this proposal.

Mr. Hartwick: I thought that was one of those with the disclaimer from you.

Mr. Yohe: It is, because they do have a minimum balance requirement, but it shouldn't come into play.

Mr. Hartwick: The second thing is I just want to make a statement about the Board's interest in making sure that we are not going with one bank and we are not going with individuals who are in our pockets. Ultimately we want to make sure that the banks in this region all have an opportunity to compete through this process. We have done this open and fair and we have taken a look at splitting up the businesses, not one person at the trough, unlike any former administration. We have done this in a fair and open process and the individuals who supply the best bids and have a vested interest in our region are the ones who are winning.

Mr. Yohe: The whole process definitely forced the rates up. Can I tell them here is where we are at and the final vote will be next week? I will get you the chart.

Mr. Haste: Yes.

Bob Christoff, Conservation District

Presentation of the Spring Creek Watershed Plan

Mr. Christoff: You should have received a copy of the proposed Spring Creek Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan. If you recall, a few weeks ago, the Commissioners adopted the Wiconisco Creek Watershed Plan. This is a very similar plan. It has been developed under the authority of the Pennsylvania Stormwater Management Act 167, which requires the County to develop stormwater management plans for all of the watersheds within your jurisdiction. In this particular plan, it is submitted to you for adoption at next week's meeting. This plan is an update of an existing 167 plan. It was done in 1993. The previous plan, at the time it was done, the requirements only addressed peak discharge rates, which is essentially the maximum rate water can be discharged from a detention basin. Since that time, DEP has changed the standards. The new plan will include that particular standard, but it will also incorporate standards for water quality, ground water recharge and channel protection. So, it is a more holistic approach to stormwater management. Similar to the Wiconisco Creek Plan, the adoption or the implementation process for the plan requires that the County adopt the plan by resolution and that there be a public hearing, which is scheduled for this Friday and submit the Plan to DEP for final approval. Once DEP approves the Plan, the standards that are outlined in the model Ordinance fall back to the municipalities to implement.

Mr. Haste: Bob, where is the hearing at?

Mr. Christoff: The public hearing will be held in the Conservation District Offices at 10:00 a.m. on June 24th.

Mr. Haste: Any questions of Bob? (There were none.)

Before we take action, will you let us know the results of the Hearing on Friday?

Mr. Christoff: Yes.

Robb Wentzel, Director of Emergency Management Agency

Presentation of the Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Preparedness Report for 2004

Mr. Haste: Before Robb begins, for those that are in the audience, some of you may know that the Susquehanna Fire System suffered a loss in the last 36 hours. Firefighter Terry Bloom from Susquehanna went home and was not feeling well and sat in his chair and apparently died of a heart attack. Terry was active in the fire company and in Susquehanna Youth Sports. He was a great guy in the community and was only 44 years old.

Mr. Wentzel: It is always tough to lose one of our own and we offer our condolences to Terry and his family and the first responders.

The first thing that I would like to present is the annual report for the Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Program. As each of you are an active member of our LEPC and attend the meetings, this report basically is a compilation of activities. This report is a mere formality of us reporting annually to document our activities as an LEPC and also of our volunteer Haz Mat Team and the revenues that we garner through the LEPC through the collection of chemical and planning fees from our SARA Title III facility. From a membership perspective on the Committee, we are happy to have a member of the Capital Area Regional Chamber of Commerce join the Committee. So, now we have members from both the Chamber of Commerce and the Tri-County Planning, which is critical to our being aware of what is happening business and industry wise in the community which helps us better plan for development and be able to prepare our response accordingly. We are still looking to secure a member from the media to sit on the Committee. We have had some unsuccessful attempts. We do have a potential candidate that we hope to have in attendance at our next LEPC Meeting.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Since we have every media outlet in Central Pennsylvania assembled here today if you want to take that message back, but I guess they already have some one.

Mr. Wentzel: This is an annual reporting requirement and your execution just underscores your acknowledgement. With each of you being active on the LEPC, this

is information that each of you are privy to at our meetings throughout the year. Your signature is requested at the Legislative Meeting for us to submit this to PEMA.

Mr. Haste: We will take action on this next week.

Robb Wentzel, EMA; David Murdoch, Asst. Mgr. Radio Systems, EMA; and SSI Services, Inc., Steve Shaver, Managing Consultant (Dauphin County Public Safety Communications System)

Emergency Management Wireless Communication Presentation

Mr. Wentzel: While Steve is preparing his graphs for his presentation, I would like to take a few moments to share with you and thank you for the opportunity for us to present the results of our evaluation of the participants and the vendors who have made oral presentations on April 25 and 26, relative to the Dauphin County Public Safety Communications Project. Obviously this is a major project. One that has garnered interest throughout the County, both the general public and most importantly the first responders community. In the last seven years since we really started first looking at the need for a new radio system, our actual 911 call volume in the COM Center has nearly doubled. We, as a County, have invested significantly in our Communications Center technology. We have been on the forefront of really developing our communications technology infrastructure to handle that 911 call volume, as was recently evidenced by our being one of eight counties to be able to handle phase 2 wireless technology. When a wireless caller calls 911 we can physically identify their location.

Unfortunately, while we have made those investments, which are positive to those that pick up the phone and call 911 and ask for help, we have not been as aggressive probably on the lesser visible side of that response, which is the communication from the 911 center to the first responder. That brings us here today to address how we close that gap and ensure that implied trust is fulfilled when that caller picks up and dials 911 and asks for help that we are able to deliver the right response at the right time to the right location. I'll turn it over to Steve to present the results of our evaluation.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just for the general public that is sitting here. Today's presentation is the technical review that was done of both vendors' equipment that was submitted. Today we are going to be listening to that presentation. It will be an opportunity for us to learn sort of the technical side of the how. On July 6th the vendors will then come in and it will be the last chance effort for the Board to sit down and ask some of the questions that still remain so that we can make our decision. We are looking at hopefully sometime in July to make the decision ultimately on which direction we are going with the project. Today is sort of the technical announcement of what was found in the report.

Mr. Shaver: First of all I am going to go back a little bit and talk about the process, as far as how we have gotten this far. Back in 1998, the Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency, who manages actually the Dauphin County Public Safety Communications Network saw an increase in calls. The bar graph (on display in the

Hearing Room) symbolizes that. We have actually taken it out to the year 2004. So, you can see the jump in calls. That continues to grow. That along with municipal governments adding additional services as far as police, fire and EMS, required Dauphin County to actually look at their capacity as far as their infrastructure to ensure that when an officer, firefighter or an EMT on the street needed access to the wireless communications infrastructure of the County; they were able to actually obtain that by pushing the button on the side of their portable or on the mobile radio and actually talking to the dispatch center. Through a competitive proposal process, at that time in 1998, the County contracted with SSI Services to do a needs assessment. This needs assessment was to actually look at the infrastructure, as far as the cell towers, communications infrastructure that actually sits at those cell towers and also, in most cases, the way 911 does business as far as Dauphin County is concerned. Through the recommendations at that time there were three main phases or processes that were suggested in that needs assessment. One was to actually renovate, relocate or eliminate certain cell towers within the network. To this date, many sites have been upgraded within the County. There was also a suggestion that the connectivity, in other words the way the RF signals or the information passes from one site to another over a wireless conduit be enhanced and improved. To date, portions of that have been upgraded. The last and most important suggestion within the realm of the recommendations was to replace the infrastructure or the base of the system that was installed back in 1972/1973. The picture displayed in the Hearing Room actually is a picture of one of the communications sites that were actually used by the County. It has since been upgraded in the Phase 1/Phase 2 approach. Because of the way the sites were designed there was a necessity in some cases for EMA staff to actually stay at a site for a period of time if there was a loss of power or if there was a bad storm. Also, that thing that is lying on the green couch is actually the skin of a snake. Unfortunately, in a lot of cases when service providers went to tower sites they would pound on the doors, make a lot of noise so that they made sure that when they reached up into a camera rack to possibly look at a connector as far as the antenna that they were not actually grabbing a snake.

Mr. Hartwick: Wouldn't that be a good thing to keep the rats away.

Mr. Shaver: The rats love to eat wires.

Mr. Hartwick: The more snakes the less rats.

Mr. Shaver: That is correct.

The Commissioners at the time in 2001 developed a Public Safety Radio Steering Committee. It was made up by various representatives from public safety throughout the County. The Committee was tasked with reviewing technology and the manufacturing capabilities of providing a network that would meet or exceed Dauphin County Radio Users' needs. The Radio Task Force recommended, through a competitive process, that Motorola be awarded a contract between the County and Motorola, because they were what the Committee felt was a complying successful

proposal. The system and technology proposed was available to the Pennsylvania political subdivisions through a State contract and the actual Radio Task Force, along with the assistance of County staff and also folks from SSI, came up with some minimum standards to actually steer that process. The Committee actually considered M/A-Com and they felt that their presentation was flawed at the time because the proposed technology was not available in the 450 MHz reigns. EF Johnson, another big company, proposed user equipment only and did not propose infrastructure.

In February 2002, the County embarked on a contract with SSI Services, again to provide professional services and advice with regard to upgrading the digital communications system, as far as the microwave background. The process started as far as which we are involved in today, the multi-site 450 Truck Radio System, a new and enhanced 450 MHz County and digital display system, which is used to alert both aide and volunteer public safety providers as far as police, fire and EMS throughout the County and to also make some improvements to the actual dispatch center, which is located on Gibson Boulevard. In the midst of all of that, because the systems are more and more becoming a computer based network, it was necessary also to look at the possibility of enhancing the network management system that more or less drives everything as far as the back room is concerned.

From November 2000 and again in January 2004, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania came to the Dauphin County Board of Commissioners with concepts of sharing the Commonwealth's Open Sky radio network. That system is an 800 MHz system, which operates on a different spectrum than what the County is currently embarking on. Unfortunately, both County personnel and SSI reviewed those proposals and found concerns regarding the spectrum availability because there are not 800 channels available in this area. Also, network control, because it would be a shared system, was an issue and also the fact that to make the system work additional costs would have to be borne by the County to put additional sites within the County's footprint.

In December 2004, M/A-Com presented a solution which they felt could provide a viable alternative for Dauphin County. In the interest of developing the most effective and efficient communications system available, this Board of Commissioners agreed to re-evaluate the proposals of both Motorola and M/A-Com. Oral presentations were conducted on April 25 and 26.

At that point in the report, we go into a bunch of evaluations. We sat down and actually had six evaluators look at both proposals, both presentations and the grading scale was tied back to what we feel, not just SSI, but the County staff and providers feel is the most important issues facing any installation of any new radio system. First of all is actually understanding what Dauphin County's needs for such a system is, the proposed technology so that it is something that can be built upon, the actual radio coverage to make sure that somebody on the street actually can talk back to that 911 Center on Gibson Boulevard, the redundancy as far as to make sure if there are any failures in the system that the system can continue to operate with back-up and then last, but not least, was actually the price point.

In summary, from the beginning through the process, the report actually reflects that in the final process through the subjected analysis and grading process, which starts on Page 7, all evaluators favored the systems and technology proposed by Motorola and agree with the early on recommendation of the Radio Committee. Motorola's technology was laid out early on and remained the same throughout this presentation. M/A-Com's submission of two proposals and their unsubstantiated specular additional needs caused confusion on the part of their evaluators. These factors, along with a very sketchy migration path to Project 25 Architecture, appear to have caused them points in the subjective analysis phase. They did however have an advantage in the area of interoperability. The pricing included in this report starts on Page 20. Prior to discounts, infrastructure costs are very comparable. It is to be noted that there is actually a 25% delta that exists between the two manufacturers prior to the application of discounts in the price of the actual mobile and portable devices, which will be used by the public safety providers in the political subdivisions of the County. In the long term this could mean higher costs in end user equipment for add ons or replacement of equipment down the road. In most cases, the evaluators detracted from both manufacturers in the subjected analysis points area, which is on Page 7. Each evaluator made comments on their own and they are actually included in the report on Page 8 through 13. We believe that they need to stand on their own merit. At one time we talked about trying to combine those, but I think each one needs to stand on its own. Basically that is the conclusion of my report.

Mr. Haste: I don't want to know the names, but can you tell me who the six evaluators were, just so I have a feel of who was looking at them?

Mr. Shaver: There were two gentlemen from the EMA staff (did not include the Director) and four individuals from SSI Services, which did not include me. The four evaluators from SSI Services were actually gentlemen that have worked on this project since its inception. Robb and I tried to stay as neutral as possible to make sure that the process made sense.

Mr. Wentzel: From our perspective, SSI was the technical staff that was basically working with this project for their entire tenure with EMA as well.

Mr. Hartwick: I think it is very important that as I take a look at the criteria here that you developed, how did you determine how to weigh the criteria?

Mr. Shaver: SSI has been in this business since 1989. Members of the staff actually went back and looked at other similar projects that we have done. As far as the evaluations that we have conducted, and we tried to grab the best issues or points from all those different projects, as far as, what most public safety entities and County staff, we felt were the most important priorities within a system and what the needs were. That is how we came up with that particular scaling and grading system.

Mr. Hartwick: Number one, I don't proclaim to be an expert in this field. It is extremely technical and I have learned so much since this process has started, but just looking at this from a layman's point of view, the value that is placed on just understanding needs, not delivering anything, is weighed very heavily. The actual interoperability which is going to be an issue that we want to make sure that we provide maximum flexibility long term, keep up with what is happening with the State to make sure that if we do develop a communications system down the road we have the ability to communicate with other counties throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the Nation is weighed lower. This Board is always concerned about being conservative fiscally and that is actually the lowest weighed part of the scale is the price value. I just need to sort of get this clear in my head why this criteria was weighed that way.

Mr. Shaver: In most cases and analyzes that we have done of similar projects in the past, your question regarding the pricing is very important. However, in some cases, going back through the documents that we prepared on behalf of other clients, the pricing has a particular merit, but in most cases the pricing, especially in a request for proposal type format, is usually one of the lower point values assessed. Why that is done, I can't particularly give you an answer. Part of the reason is the fact that if you weigh things as far as price at a very high level there is a concern that the actual system itself could suffer, i.e., if you basically made it a very, very high level, the system itself might not meet all the rest of the requirements that the Committee laid out early on and would actually detract from the system itself. That was probably one of the reasons. In most cases we try to leave it wide open. I will tell you that speaking to one of the evaluators, because he gave no points to either manufacturer, he said that his reasoning behind that was that he thought that their price points were still off.

Mr. Haste: I just flipped the numbers, if you would have put the priorities where you said and gave them the 20 points and flipped it the outcome would not have changed. If you run the numbers either way, whatever categories you put priority on when you look at it with few exceptions Motorola got the higher rating. When you flip the numbers around it would not have changed the outcome.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, I am just trying to understand the process.

Mr. Haste: I wanted to do that to see, because of someone's priority, if that became bias one way or the other and it does not.

Mr. Hartwick: The other concern obviously is we hear so much with new communications systems that the technology is critically important and everybody turns around and says it is not the technology's fault it is something I didn't have control over. If the technology is good it is something that was out of our control. We are worried about making a large investment and the technology was obviously the disqualifying factor for one of the vendors prior to the resubmissions. Obviously the technology has to be up to par or we are going to be the brunt of why didn't you invest more money.

Mr. Shaver: The other thing too from going back there is some other data in our report that talks about the coverage percentages and a bunch of other issues. Those are some of the things that weigh heavily on the evaluators' heads. From day one the mission of that Committee was the coverage within the metro area as far as to boost that up so a portable would work in a pretty dense building and also to make sure there was no difference between a provider in the northern part of the County or the southern part of the County as far as what their needs were.

Mr. Hartwick: I know that coverage is critical. You as a Steelon guy know what the problems were in our community. I am just trying to understand the rest of the criteria. Coverage is the whole reason that we had the idea of trying to move this thing forward.

Have you been monitoring what has been happening with the current State developments?

Mr. Shaver: Yes, we have.

Mr. Hartwick: Can you give us a short update on where we are at with any of the State developments? I know we re-examined that.

Mr. Shaver: The last published article that I have seen was actually tied to Cumberland County. It was one of our clients also. The State system, as you know, is a mobile system. Now, there is that magical area around the Capitol building that will require portable coverage to a certain level within that ring. Coverage in Harrisburg and Cumberland County areas is very, very good off the system. Currently, the largest user on that system is actually the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. They are deployed and are using the system on a daily basis. The Pennsylvania State Police continue to use the system as far as the data application, which we talked about that process early on. There are plans in the works to make some enhancements to the system which I believe the State's Radio Group is actually looking at. There has been, I guess, a proposal that has been going back and forth for information that we received from some of our different clients who are actually deploying that technology, both Lancaster and Cumberland Counties, where there are going to be some enhancements or changes made to the network.

Mr. Hartwick: We talk about interoperability and talk about how this process is moving. I just don't want to be standing alone in a process where we want to make sure that interoperability is a critical component and we have the ultimate flexibility to adjust or readjust what we are currently doing. Let's say the Fed's come out with a gold standard that they want to provide after we decided that we want to take on this investment and if we really want a well run communications system I think we would all agree that the Federal Government should step up and fund it, post 911 that's probably the biggest priority. I just want to make sure that we have flexibility to be able to do that within the system.

Mr. Wentzel: Right now basically what we are looking at, we do and we will. We have the Regional County Terrorism Task Force and PEMA has also allocated on the State 800 system two separate channels that would be strictly dedicated for an emergency response any where in the Commonwealth. If an emergency situation took place, which required a regional response in Dauphin County, the base of operation would be our radio system. Responders coming in from out of County, in a regional concept, would then be issued a bank of radios that would have communications capability on the 800 system, which is what we are working on the regional concept as funded through Federal dollars. We also, depending on how technical you want to get, have a link with the State system through our 911 center right now. We do have a way to talk, at least from our 911 Center on the State system and Dave Murdoch can share with you the details on that whenever it is convenient for you. Rest assured that the interoperability piece is a critical piece to us. Back to one of your earlier questions, when we looked at this, Steve and I were being the impartial brokers on this, we really looked on Page 7 from Proposed Technology down to Interoperability. Those four key criteria as part of the grading scale even though you look at understanding Dauphin County's needs are important as far as understanding the needs assessment. You are really putting roughly 70% of the rating on the actual technology and on the actual system itself to meet the needs and provide those issues that you have addressed concerns about coverage, interoperability and redundancy. If there is a failure at one site we don't take the whole system off the air. The real heart of the grading scale, and Steve correct me if I am wrong, is 70% of the proposal is really tied into detailing what it is that is going to be delivered to ensure that those criteria are met and the system that is delivered ultimately meets our needs long term.

Mr. Hartwick: It is interesting to see when you take a look through the evaluators how many of them had different opinions.

Mr. Haste: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: And completely different opinions.

Mr. Shaver: We wanted them to, because of the fact that everybody visualizes and sees something a little different than another person. The other thing, going back to the interoperability, is the fact that from day one the project team, including County staff, has built in two requirements for both these proposals as far as the interoperability piece. So, there will be interoperability built into which ever manufacturer the Board would want to go with. That is part of the process and part of the proposals.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Looking at the ratings and I understand people had opinions all over the board, one of the problems I have is if you rate a zero point value I would expect there to be a comment as to why you did. Two of the evaluators, on two occasions, I think there was no comment. I know you discussed the comment, but that should have been in there.

Mr. Shaver: Unfortunately, he did not write it down on the document so I didn't want to...

Mr. DiFrancesco: That's good, but it would have been helpful if he would have actually put that down. As far as the interoperability piece, could you explain a little bit why with so many neighboring systems built by one particular vendor that the interoperability piece should be a little easier to overcome. Is that too simple? I would expect their numbers to be a little stronger on that side, but again this is with no technical understanding of why the evaluation came out the way it did.

Mr. Shaver: One would and that is why the comments in the summary section as far as the fact that would make sense, but again going back to the fact that the evaluators did not see it that way. That is why the difference. I am not sure, one of the reasons I think possibly is the whole P-25 concept. The idea behind P-25 was to basically make it so that anybody's radio, along as it was a P-25 compliance system radio, could actually play onto a P-25 system within the same MHz or spectrum type mask. I believe that there is a possibility that might have been one of the concerns. That is just me guessing. I really didn't ask them that question. The dollars and cents one I did ask them because it kind of hit me why didn't you give them any points at all and you said there were no comments. His reasoning for no comments was the fact that they both stunk.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As I mentioned earlier, this is an opportunity for us to get your report, hear what you have to say and ask you some technical side questions. We will have the opportunity in a matter of two weeks to ask the vendors themselves for maybe some clarity on some of these points as well.

Mr. Haste: Have the vendors been given this report?

Mr. Shaver: No, they have not.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The P-25 compliance, I know that was a question that was outstanding. The vendors came in and did their presentation. There were some questions on the P-25 side. Do those questions remain unanswered?

Mr. Shaver: All questions that we had during the session, when they did their oral presentations, they complied and got back to us with written documents as far as the different things that they couldn't bring out at their particular session. All the information that was requested at those sessions was returned to the Committee to review. They answered all the questions that were brought up as far as the P-25 and a bunch of other things also.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As far as P-25 compliance, both systems are not?

Mr. Shaver: No.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Both systems are not.

Mr. Shaver: The M/A-Com presentations and proposals, the two of them are not P-25 systems. The actual portables and mobiles probably if you picked up an auction they could be P-25 compliant. The actual backbone, since it is tower sites and so forth, in both proposals M/A-Com they were not P-25.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Explain to me as far as where the industry is headed, homeland security regulations and so forth? Is it important that the system be P-25 or is it just important that the radios be P-25 or does the system have to be P-25 in order for a P-25 radio to operate on the system?

Mr. Shaver: The P-25 piece was laid out early on by the Radio Committee and also as far as staff. Yes, it was an important factor. As far as the fact can a P-25 radio work on a non P-25 system? The answer would be yes. As long as the radio is capable of doing the particular manufacturer's scheme as far as the way they lay their channel plan out and the way they actually download data to the radios so that the radio knows where to go on the system. An example of that would be as far as the Commonwealth's system. The portables and the mobiles on the Commonwealth system do not have P-25 capability. However, the infrastructure as far as the Commonwealth is deploying is not a P-25 infrastructure. I can take that even farther and get really bogged in a lot of information because their particular system, the way it is laid out, is a particular technology and a particular scheme as far as the channels are concerned. The Commonwealth, at some given time, depending on how far the P-25 process goes, there is a possibility that the State system could be P-25. I don't know if they are going to go there. There is none that I know of, FDMA P-25 standard and that is part of this whole technology thing. It gets very convoluted and a little bit confusing. As far as the M/A-Com Proposals, they do have a P-25 technology that could have been plugged into the process, so there would have been a third proposal. But, they did not do that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We will ask them at the time.

Mr. Shaver: The terminals, as far as the mobiles and portables, they laid out in their proposals probably could be upgraded to P-25, but the infrastructure was not as far as the actual devices that sit at tower sites.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This may not be a fair question. How familiar are you with Federal grant and regulations?

Mr. Shaver: P-25 is very, very high in those requests for grants and so forth.

Mr. DiFrancesco: It is my understanding that if it is not a P-25 compliant system that makes it that much more difficult to try to get Federal dollars.

Mr. Shaver: That is the way that I understand it too.

Mr. DiFrancesco: You made a comment earlier and it kind of flew past me. You mentioned something about frequency spectrum. There were some questions with the frequency spectrum. I'm trying to remember what you said.

Mr. Shaver: As far as the Commonwealth's piece?

Mr. DiFrancesco: No, it was as far as the evaluation.

Mr. Shaver: M/A-Com, in their proposals, basically were going to obtain an additional spectrum for the County and we had asked at one of those sessions if they could provide us that information and they did not. So, basically their design is not using the channels that we basically had planned from the beginning to use to license. They actually said that they needed more and actually went out on their own and tried to procure more. That is something that maybe you can ask them directly, because we did not get an answer.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Specifically, in terms of interoperability, we have already been contacted by the Borough of Pillow and their going into Northumberland County. From a technical side, I'm not 100% certain, when you looked at the neighboring counties in the interoperability piece, how realistic is it to say that when we go and build this new system we can overcome some of the challenges that have existed where units are on a consistent basis rolling into other counties or other counties are rolling into Dauphin County?

Mr. Shaver: Technically, the only County that neighbors Dauphin that possibly will have, well they do, have a 450 system would be Lebanon. If you go into Cumberland's 800 MHz it would mean another radio. Going into Schuylkill, I believe it is a hodge podge as far as similar to what Dauphin County had previously. There is a possibility that in some cases those neighboring agencies could possibly, through a patch with interoperability, actually use their new Dauphin County radio, whoever the manufacturer is. However, there also is another issue as far as coverage going out to another neighboring community. As long as you can bring coverage with you, in other words that Dauphin County's system plays into Cumberland County, we can do cross patching and tying together of both systems. However, if you go into Cumberland County and Dauphin County's system does not cover in Cumberland County that could present a problem. Interoperability, everybody has magical mystical black boxes that they will install and take care of, but you have to bring your coverage with you. In other words, you have to bring with you that footprint where your radio system actually covers out.

Mr. Haste: Is that part of this plan to do that?

Mr. Shaver: No, because there is also some licensing issues as far as the FCC is concerned. In most cases the FCC doesn't want your system to go every where. It basically wants you to have a particular footprint that basically is five miles or ten miles outside the boundary. So, there will be some issues as far as interoperability is concerned, as far as taking your coverage with you. Any body has that problem,

because of the fact that systems will only play so far and the other thing is there is not an unlimited amount of spectrum. The FCC puts restrictions on how far out the system can play. The State with the Terrorism Task Force has obviously tried to lay out a plan there as far as the radios and to make sure that they have enough infrastructure to stay on that 800 system. The West Shore would probably be covered. Going into Lebanon County, interoperability could occur even onto Lebanon's system, if Lebanon had some computers in that area that would actually be on a conventional type channel. The only way that it could be a clean switch over would be the fact that we would have to go with one manufacturer and go as far as into the Lebanon system. There are still interoperability issues. There is no silver bullet. Some people say there are, but there are not, unless everybody bought the same stuff on the same frequency and you had coverage all over the world.

Mr. Haste: Are you saying if you need assistance to run to the middle of the County, stay away from the borders?

Mr. Shaver: I'm not saying that. What I am trying to say is that you have to take that into consideration and operationally, spectrum or technology will not always solve an interoperability problem. In a lot of cases it is an operational structure as far as how things are done.

Mr. Haste: How is that in this plan? Some of our most rural communities border other counties and that is where we are going to need help.

Mr. Shaver: Both proposals were laid out that there is interoperability in a basic portion of the proposals to take that into consideration.

Mr. Haste: Both plans will address that?

Mr. Shaver: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Satisfactorily?

Mr. Shaver: Satisfactorily as far as what technology can take you.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The bottom line is that the technology doesn't exist.

Mr. Zellhart: If I could help Steve out here. I have been the Project Manager since 1990. About the bordering counties, we did put the requirement on both vendors that there be mobile coverage three miles into the bordering counties. At least in that three mile border, past the Dauphin border, you will have coverage onto our system, but any further than that you couldn't guarantee the coverage above three miles. You could, but it would double the price of your system.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just to put a face on this issue so the public can understand what we are talking about. When Dauphin County units rolled into Campbelltown to assist them

with the tornadoes, would they or would they not have had contact at the time and would they under this system be in a better position to have contact?

Mr. Zellhart: If you were on this system during that you would have mobile coverage there.

Mr. DiFrancesco: At the time they rolled how were we in contact with those units under the current system?

Mr. Wentzel: Our existing system, given the nature of the situation we did have coverage with the units in Campbelltown on the existing system.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Even with the existing system we were able to communicate with them?

Mr. Wentzel: Our COM Center could communicate with them, however, the caveat with our existing system does not have any direct patches to Lebanon County. So, a Dauphin County user in Campbelltown, using a Dauphin County radio could not talk directly to a Lebanon County user standing beside them.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So, what we are talking about here is under the new system the interoperability would allow that to take place.

Mr. Wentzel: It is planned to have patches with the adjoining counties for day-to-day operations within the coverage distant limitations. You are guaranteed three miles, but you may have spotty coverage beyond that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: For clarity, had that incident taken place at the other end of Lebanon County, on the far side of Lebanon County, then there is no fix that would have got us to be able to communicate for the most part.

Mr. Wentzel: They would need a radio on Lebanon's system.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The only other question I have at this time is in terms of equipment cost. I am assuming that in this report that the costs that you quote were the portables, radios, the user equipment were part of the bid package. As much as the big numbers are...

Mr. Shaver: All of the numbers are basically taken from the proposals from the two manufacturers.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This was actually part of the quotes.

Another big consideration and a lot of the companies I talked to so far in terms of EMS, police and so forth are very concerned that with the new system they are going to have to replace their radios. Aside from the County's cost, they are going to probably have to

incur some costs as well. I know that radio replacement is part of the program, but it may not be a complete replacement as what some companies wish to have. We have to be cautious of what we are doing to them as they spend money as well. That also comes down to the P-25 piece, am I not correct? If it is P-25 compliant there are more vendors in the market place, the radios have ultimately more competition.

Mr. Shaver: That is correct. Actually at the beginning that is one of the reasons why EF Johnson never created an infrastructure. They just basically came with portables and they would be willing to sell those to the County at X cost for any community that might want to buy additional radios.

Mr. Haste: Steve, there have been some questions the last few days where we have had dead spots and the importance of covering those dead spots. Can you address that?

Mr. Shaver: One of the biggest issues is because of the way the County is laid out geographically, any where along the river is an issue. That was taken care of in the old system. The one site fell down and the site had to be moved to a different location. In that move a portion of the river basin was covered a little better than what the portion that lies more or less between the far end of the County and more or less the Harrisburg Metro area. So, there was actually at one time a bunch of holes in Steelton Borough. The low band paging system, in Steelton Borough, the County actually has to activate their pagers twice. The reason why they do that is they do that off of two different tower sites. Depending on where that volunteer is the pager will go off. So, actually the County now has to generate more or less two sets of tones, same two tones, twice so they can go off of two different sites. The other thing, as far as the Dauphin narrows area, that has always been an issue also. The area in Lower Swatara Township, down around more or less the Vine Street/Swatara Creek area, has always been an issue. One of the things as far as the needs assessment and the recommendations as far as phase 1 and phase 2, some of those things have been carried out so there actually has been some improvements as far as coverage. There are still quite a few holes. The other thing is that the County, through an agreement with one of the vendors, has actually moved the one site so that there is a little bit better coverage as far as police into Steelton Borough off of an additional site. There is additional cost involved with that also. We can actually, if you would like, to show you the maps as far as where...

Mr. Haste: I've seen the maps. There have been questions so I wanted you to address them.

Mr. Shaver: Also, in fairness to staff, they try to take care of as many holes as they can, but sometimes you are limited because the string is only so long. It only goes so far, as far as coverage is concerned.

Mr. Haste: Under this plan, most of those holes are taken care of.

Mr. Shaver: Almost all the holes are covered basically as far as the metro area. The coverage is some where in the neighborhood of 95%.

Mr. Haste: In the northeastern part of the County, we still have a few spots.

Mr. Shaver: Yes, that is correct. We tried to take care of as many of them as we can. Unfortunately as far as coverage is concerned the old return on investment kind of concept, in other words you could put in two more sites and might get one more percent of coverage. In those cases, unfortunately, just like the river, it is almost a geographic or terrain issue. It has to do with the lay of the land.

Mr. Haste: I didn't see this as any part of the criteria, but I know some of the discussions that at least Nick has had with the vendors is the importance of what dollars they could bring to the table. Do they have the ability to help us get grants and some outside funding, because that is one of Nick's concern to keep the cost down? Where are we on that?

Mr. Shaver: Both manufacturers were told on many occasions that there is an issue as far as looking at the possibility of grants and so forth. I know that one of the manufacturers has come forth and said different things in different items. I don't know about the other one to be honest. I know both vendors have staff that does grant writing, either in-house or externally to the corporations. No one has been told to bring a proposal and that was not from day one any of the pre-requirements that were laid out to them.

Mr. Haste: We will ask them when they are here.

Mr. Hartwick: The answer is there is no definitive amount of money.

Mr. Shaver: That is correct.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The cost outlined in the proposal is not the whole package, correct? The County's cost?

Mr. Shaver: That is correct.

Mr. DiFrancesco: What are those numbers, because I know the question has come up to me in the last couple of days through the media outlet they want to know where we are in terms of overall costs? This is part of it, what is the other part of it?

Mr. Shaver: Basically the other part would be additional sites, microwave, some enhancements as far as grounding and so forth and actually moving some walls around in some of the equipment rooms as far the OC is concerned. The actual furniture, it isn't really furniture as far as the consoles in the COM Center, all of those have to be replaced. The other thing would be as far as the actual elevated work, some work needs to be done in the COM Center. Those would be all the costs. The whole total

project is in the neighborhood of \$33 to \$35 million. Depending on what these prices come in at, that could possibly be dropped a little bit.

Mr. DiFrancesco: You are saying today as it is on paper?

Mr. Shaver: Correct.

Mr. Haste: So what you are saying is all of those things that you just listed are about \$13 to \$15 million.

Mr. Wentzel: Mike Yohe has a full detailed listing including a suggested amortization schedule relative to the decision that gets made and how the financing lays out.

Mr. Hartwick: Life expectancy of this system that you are proposing?

Mr. Shaver: Probably around 15 to 20 years.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there a difference in life expectancy between the two?

Mr. Shaver: No.

Mr. DiFrancesco: From a technical side?

Mr. Shaver: Not really. (Mr. Shaver showed the Commissioners a picture.) That station is about 30 years old. One site actually has a base station that is older than the technician you have on staff. You can always say that things are going to last longer, but we try to use the 15 to 20 year thing. You probably will get more time out of it, but you just don't know.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The last question that I am going to ask is one that has been asked of me and of this whole Board. I certainly hope that at this point in time it is a softball question and I am going to ask some of the folks in the audience that during the public presentation I would even invite them to answer this question. Why now and what is pushing it?

Mr. Shaver: One of the biggest issues is the fact that the County did their phase 1 and phase 2 as far as the things that could be done to make improvements, which in some cases were nothing more than band-aids. I hate to say that, but basically the system has been band-aided and twined together for quite some time. The \$33 to \$35 million number is staring us in the face and I think the thing is you can't go any further. The County needs additional spectrum and there is no spectrum that can be obtained in the low band area or the 450 MHz area. That is one big issue. The County, back when the study was done, did a project where calls were sent out to police cars with a computer so that cut down on some of the voice traffic. If an officer is in trouble and needs assistance there needs to be a channel for the County to switch them to. Unfortunately,

that does not exist. There is one, but if you get two emergencies at the same time it could be disastrous.

Mr. DiFrancesco: So you are saying capacity?

Mr. Shaver: Capacity is a big issue. The other thing as far as the infrastructure, not so much the infrastructure, but actually the portables and mobiles that are in the field, those are in need of upgrade. The capacity issue is the biggest thing I see. When the study was done there was a bunch of what we call "ear langs" as far as your busy times of the day and those kinds of things, there is a possibility that someone could try to call in and would not be able to call in because they couldn't get the air time to do it. There needs to be additional spectrum or additional channels for some body to work off of or talk off of.

Mr. Wentzel: Specific to that question, we had incidents which we can share, obviously we don't want to get into a lot of detail, we had one of our Federal VIP visits during the election season, we lost communication with the law enforcement detail. If something would have happened during that detail we would have had no way to communicate with them or them with us. The incident that happened within the last year, I believe it was in Steelton, with a Steelton officer in a basement with an individual that ended up shooting and an officer was injured, if it hadn't been for some of this reengineering, band-aid fix, had we not done that on the side we would not have been able to communicate with that officer, which was critical. It ultimately turned out to be a successful outcome for our law enforcement officials. Before that band-aid fix, and it is truly a band-aid, there would have been no communication on that incident where you had an officer exchanging fire with the perpetrator. Those were two isolated incidents at this end. We can document incidents above the mountain. From an operational security perspective we don't want to share too much. While the public needs to know, we also need to protect the safety and interest of our law enforcement, fire and EMS personnel as well.

Mr. Saylor: For the folks that are here, what happens if the bucket is not there and water gets in there, then what happens?

Mr. Wentzel: It shorts out the base and we lose communication and I have to wake Dave up at 2:00 a.m. to go find out why.

Mr. Saylor: Would you lose communication in just this area?

Mr. Wentzel: Whatever that tower site covers. If that tower site is part of a link just for that area, but is critical to pushing a signal out to another part of the County, we would not only lose it for that area, but a part of that link.

Mr. Saylor: Would it impact the rest of the system?

Mr. Wentzel: Absolutely.

Mr. Saylor: How?

Mr. Wentzel: We can't communicate. Essentially if a 911 call comes in we go to dispatch, we can't dispatch or we can't communicate with somebody...

Mr. DiFrancesco: It is that one light bulb on the chain of Christmas lights that goes out and shuts down the whole rest of the line.

Mr. Saylor: Would the whole system be inoperable?

Mr. Wentzel: That exact picture would take out one radio to cover that localized area which that tower site covers. As far as the chain, the backbone to provide the connectivity between all the sites is a data chain, a Christmas light. One light goes out they all go out. Depending on where that break is, thunderstorms, lightning can take down a site now and wherever that break is further out you don't have communication with the rest of the County. Not just on one service, all of them. Part of this improvement system is redundancy, a dual loop system, that one site can go and you are not going to take out the entire County.

Mr. Saylor: My point is at the time this bucket was keeping the whole system operating.

Mr. Wentzel: Keeping that area operational, yes.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: In addition to the Personnel Packet, we have the increases for July. I could go over the Salary Board items first.

We are eliminating the Interim Fill Correctional Officer at the Prison. Someone did not report for work so we did not need that position. In Children and Youth, we are eliminating a Computer Systems Analyst 2 and creating an Information Technology Generalist 2 position. In EMA, we are creating an Assistant Manager of Radiological Planning and Training.

Mr. Haste: Did Tom Guenther look at #2?

Mr. Hartwick: Yes, he did. I didn't want to move forward unless Tom was okay with it.

Ms. Sinner: In District Justice Wenner's Office, he is creating a Legal Clerk 1 position. In Information Technology, they are eliminating a Programmer I position and creating an Information Systems Specialist 2. This is actually a reclassification of a position that is occupied. Are there any questions on those transactions? (There were none.)

The following positions are being requested to fill: Children and Youth, two Caseworker positions; Facilities Maintenance, a part time Custodian position; EMA, a Database

Technician; and Information Technology, a Help Desk Analyst. In the interest of getting the Database Technician position filled as quickly as possible, I am requesting that we vote for approval today on Item #3. I also have a couple other items that I am going to request a vote for. Domestic Relations is requesting permission to fill two Clerk positions.

The New Hires, you have a part-time Custodian in Facilities Maintenance; Caseworkers in Children and Youth; Item #11 is an RN Supervisor at Spring Creek. I am requesting permission for a vote to approve that hire today as well. On the Personnel Changes, I am requesting to approve Item #17 today. Are there any questions on any of the new hires, vacancies or changes? (There were none.)

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve Item #3 under the Requests to Post/Fill Vacancies, #11 under the New Hires and #17 under the Personnel Changes; motion carried.

Ms. Sinner: I have overtime reports and an overtime request.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have one comment for both of you. We have a number of layoffs that are going to take place at Spring Creek and I would appreciate it if you make an effort to identify vacancies that may exist in other parts of the County that may be suitable for some of those people. If we can't find homes for them at Spring Creek in other positions it would be nice for us to be able to offer them possibly maintenance for maintenance at some place else. I need Personnel to be thinking about that right now so if we can find homes for those people in other departments that we move in that direction and try to give them first crack at it. The goal of the Board is to not layoff anybody. If we can find other positions for them we want to do that.

Ms. Sinner: We have the increases for July. Do you have any questions on that?

Mr. Schreiber: We have provided you with a list of employees that identifies the increases. As you know we went through a merit process with a value based upon evaluations. I am pleased to report that we have received over 700 nonunion employees' evaluations. Only three did not receive an evaluation and we have communicated with those individuals and we should get those very soon. There are two reports. One with comments that is rather small print and hard to read, but it provides you with a little bit more information. The second one is without comments. We have highlighted the exceptions to the normal increases. It is there for your review and we will continue to update the receipt of evaluations.

Mr. Haste: If we have questions we will get a hold of you between now and next week.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: You should have all received a report yesterday. As you know there are a couple of budget issues that we need to take care of. Mike and I are already working

on those. Do you have any questions on any of the items? If not, you can review it and if you have any questions between now and next week, please let me know. We will get the report cleaned up budget wise and have it ready for your approval next week.

Mr. Hartwick: The service agreements for micro-cassette recorders seem pretty high. It is on Page 6. We are paying \$246 for a service agreement just for micro-cassettes and recorders.

Mr. Baratucci: The quantity is three.

Mr. Hartwick: How much would it cost for new ones?

Mr. Baratucci: I believe the new ones might be in the vicinity of \$300 or \$400. These are \$82 for an entire year should anything go wrong. It is kind of like the typewriter service agreements that are \$49 for a year. If you take the service agreement, you get a cleaning already included and pretty much for an entire year \$49 or \$82 is probably worth it. We always leave that up to the departments on whether they want to take the chance or not. I can give you an example with our Security Department. They actually did well by taking a chance because to cover all of the x-ray machines would have been upwards of I think \$30,000 for a year. We have been successful in not taking the agreements there, although, in your packet today you will see a \$9,000 expenditure for repair.

Mr. Haste: But that is versus \$30,000.

Mr. Baratucci: Basically when the service agreements are that expensive I think you want to look at them a little more closely because you might make out better. When it is \$80...

Mr. Hartwick: \$80 for a \$300 piece of equipment. If you have a three year agreement you could buy a new one.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think my question would really be how many...

Mr. Baratucci: \$82 a piece for a year.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How many of those micro-cassette recorders are we covering?

Mr. Baratucci: Three.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is three here, but I am sure there are more throughout.

Mr. Baratucci: There are not that many of those. We don't use many of them. This is for the Court Administrator's Office. There may be a couple in your Office here, but there isn't that many of them throughout the County.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would hope certainly at least for our usage, we have an inexpensive... Certain products like this are disposable at this point in time. If it is getting used hard and heavy, I don't know what the Courts are using it for it may be a different story. The Commissioner makes a pretty good point that \$82 for a service contract, these things are not worth a whole lot. Hopefully it would have a three year life expectancy. That is far different than a fax machine.

Mr. Haste: Have Carolyn take a look at it.

Mr. Baratucci: If it is something that you don't want to get service agreements on you can just communicate that to them and we don't have to. Service agreements are always an option. I just look at the cost sometimes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Some of them make sense and some do not.

Mr. Hartwick: I think the micro-cassette is not the issue. I see service contracts come through here for a ton of money. I am just wondering do we get the value for the service contracts or would it be easier for us to do a schedule for equipment replacement.

Mr. Haste: We do both of those. Randy looks at that quite a bit. Security is a prime example. We did not take a service agreement, we took the risk.

Mr. Hartwick: He said that he gives the directors the option.

Mr. Baratucci: I rely on them based on their need to tell me how hard they use it, how many repairs they think they are going to get. I think what happens sometimes is we have always had a lot of policies where our equipment replacement sometimes is the very last thing in a budget process. Meaning that and I believe you guys have done this since you have been here, no equipment. Equipment is just taken out of the budget. That is the easiest thing to cut when you want to cut. In fairness to the departments, they try to make due with equipment that they have figuring that it is going to be more difficult to get new, because sometimes it is. They try to keep things up and running. I trust that most of the people do look at these things and do opt to go the best way they think. Either way you can make a judgment call and sometimes you are going to be right and sometimes you are not. In this particular one, a lot of times if you need service it could be upwards of \$100 per hour. You are right here on cassette recorders you could throw it away. You could buy a new one for \$300 or \$400. It is a call that you have to make. In this particular case, I will ask them to take a look at it.

Mr. Hartwick: I don't want to micro manage you, but as I see those issues come up maybe I will just bring them to your attention and we will see what the value is there. I am sure you are evaluating them as well.

Mr. Baratucci: Quite frankly if the Board gets this report I'm recommending that we approve them. If there is an issue and I don't think they should I will bring that up to you

prior to it being on the Report. It doesn't mean that just because I recommend that you have to agree. If you think not, we can do it the other way.

Mr. Hartwick: That is one that I just happen to disagree with.

Mr. Baratucci: I will ask her to take a look at it and will ask her to respond and we will work from there.

REPORT FROM SOLICITOR – WILLIAM TULLY, ESQ.

Mr. Tully: Nothing to add, happy to answer any questions. (There were none.)

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Saylor: We need to approve a travel request for the District Attorney's Office. It is Item #16 on your packet. Apparently it is taking place prior to the next meeting.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the following training request from the District Attorney's Office: Ed Marsico, Fran Chardo, Sandee O'Hara, Jenni Allen, Shannon Kerwin, Dominick Muracco and Steve Zawisky to attend the PDAA Summer Meeting on June 26-29, 2005 in Gettysburg, PA, at an approximate cost of \$2,232.80; motion carried.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/VOTE

- A. Appoint Dolores S. Miller to the Area Agency on Aging Council.
- B. Refund to Corporate Gateway General Partnership the penalties and interest on iterim 2003 County and Library taxes on parcel #35-034-094 in the amount of \$2,762.23.

(These items will be placed on the Agenda next week for consideration.)

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: I have two items that I would like to bring to your attention. In the past, the Board has spoken a lot about finding new sources of revenue to supplement property tax dollars. We are always looking for County services that we can charge fees for. It seems that we are not the only ones searching for new sources of revenue. The State Department of Revenue is moving forward with identifying areas where it can impose sales tax. One area that they are looking at is to charge sales tax on copies that the County charges for routine pieces of paperwork. CCAP has arranged a meeting with the Department of Revenue to discuss this issue. We have been notified, so you are aware. They have put together a working group consisting of representatives from the Commissioners around the State, row officers and the Courts to sit down with the Department to discuss this whole issue. They are hoping to meet sometime in July. As

we go forward in identifying new sources of revenue the memo that CCAP sent out does seem to indicate that a legislative remedy to exempt counties from collection of the sales tax would be unconstitutional since under the Uniformity Clause tax exemptions are based on the tax status of the payer, not the collector. So, as we go forward to identify new sources of revenue, we need to consider collecting sales tax on some of these items.

Mr. Haste: It would not be new revenue for us.

Mr. Saylor: That is true.

Mr. Haste: Actually it would be an additional expense for us so the State can get more money. It sounds like good cooperation between us and the State.

Mr. DiFrancesco: It also sounds fundamentally wrong in terms of governmental operations writing the information. It sounds like there would be an issue there that the State shouldn't even be able to impose sales tax on those issues, but...

Mr. Saylor: Good luck with that.

COMMISSIONERS' DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

Mr. Hartwick: With the Solicitor's Report, is there any changes to the travel policy that we have had. Is that just a routine pre-approval?

Mr. Haste: Gary Serhan has made quite a few changes.

Mr. Saylor: I indicated that before, it must have been the meeting that we had while you were away.

Mr. Hartwick: Could I have a copy of that?

Mr. Saylor: Absolutely.

Mr. Hartwick: Could I have Mel pull some of the Human Services Agreements? I will get with Mel after the meeting to take a look at them. Thanks.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: We are again at the point in time for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board? Please come forward and state your name.

Mr. Konkle: My name is Don Konkle and I am the Fire Chief and EMA Coordinator in the City of Harrisburg. I am here today as President of the Dauphin County Fire Chiefs Association. The Fire Chiefs Association has been involved in the radio project since

2000. At that time there was a very active committee that looked at all the presentations and felt very comfortable with Motorola. We heard the presentations a couple weeks ago and we thought that Motorola was the best value. At the May Meeting, the Chiefs Association voted their support, whatever the vendor consultant would recommend. We felt that they had the best knowledge. Clearly, we are very comfortable with Motorola's proposal. We would like to thank the three of you for continuing to push this project forward and we think that it is extremely important, both from a firefighter safety or first responder safety and a public safety issue. Communications are vital. We offer our support and thank you.

On the interoperability issue, I have spent much more of my life than I wish to think about looking at home security issues, since 2001. We have come to a different understanding about what interoperability means. At one time I envisioned interoperability as the September 11 – World Trade Center. My concept was that I could get in my Chief's car and drive to New York City and talk to people the whole way there. That is not interoperability. The first thing that we need to understand is if there was a major incident in Harrisburg and the capability existed if we had a 1,000 first responders show up in Harrisburg that they could all talk at the same time. The system wouldn't permit it and we couldn't do daily operations. People are still going to have heart attacks and crash their cars into telephone poles. It is necessary that we look at how that works. I think Steve talked about the organization of responses into task forces. So, if I need ten search and rescue units or 20 engine companies, I ask for a task force. If they would come out of Cumberland County or Allegheny County they would arrive in group. We would give them one portable for the Dauphin County system to their unit commander. I can talk to that guy and he would use his talkaround capabilities on his frequencies to do that and talk to those 20 other units. So we don't have a 1,000 people chattering back and forth, we have 50 or 60 and then they are talking to the task force that they brought. It is as much of an incident command function then it is technology. That is what the region is in the process of doing. The operation is a little bit different. Right now I have separate frequencies for Dauphin County, a unit out of York County and I get one out of Cumberland County and it says Harrisburg's frequency. I still have four radios. This system will cure much of that problem. Thank you again.

Mr. McCready: I am John McCready, Emergency Management Coordinator for Williamstown Borough and Williams Township. You said why now? I know in the upper end we heard in the presentation about stuff in Steelton and the lower end. In the upper end, we basically have no portable communications with the County. If our chief has to talk to County at a scene or something he has to either relay it to somebody at an apparatus or he has to come to the apparatus itself. It is very important to us in the upper end that this project move along. Thank you.

Mr. Haste: I knew that was one of the parts of the County that has holes.

Mr. McCready: It is very bad in the northeast.

Captain Pickles: I'm Captain Pickles, Commander of the Technical Services Division of the Harrisburg Police. I just took it over in February of this year. We are very much in favor of the Countywide radio system also. Communications is a major thing we need for the County. The City also has their buckets in the form of phone books and 2 x 4s. From what I understand of the project, the City would like to be included in on the enhancements end of it, as far as the equipment, furniture and the flooring and things like that. We have a lot of upgrades that we need also as does the County. We would also like to be included in on that part.

Mr. Haste: Mr. Shaver, do you have that factored in and are you aware of that?

Mr. Shaver: The communications center at the City is actually the back up as far as the County is concerned. Consoles and furniture has been included. There are enhancements included in the project for the City of Harrisburg.

Mr. Haste: Before we adjourn, just a reminder that we have a Retirement Board Meeting, which will start at 12:00 Noon.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Meeting adjourn.

Transcribed by: Richie Martz

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

printed