



**DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**WORKSHOP MEETING**

**July 12, 2006**  
**10:00 A.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

Jeff Haste, Chairman (Absent)

**STAFF PRESENT**

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Marie E. Rebuck, Controller; Robert F. Dick, Treasurer; William Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Tom Guenther, Director of IT; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Faye Fisher, Director of Personnel; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Steve Shaver, EMA; Sharon Way, Personnel; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Dan Robinson, Director of Community & Economic Development; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; George Connor, Community & Economic Development; Bob Hawley, Deputy Court Administrator; Diane McNaughton, Commissioners' Office; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Leila McAdoo, Solicitor's Office; Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Commissioners' Office

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Jack Sherzer, Eugene Stilp, Rev. Ron Tilley, Jim Nettle and Eric Hershey

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have three sets of minutes that will be considered at next week's meeting.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have reached the point in time in the Workshop Meeting for public participation. Is there anyone in the public that would like to address the Board? (There was none.)

## **DIRECTORS/GUESTS**

### **Commissioners**

#### ***Presentation of Proclamation to Gene Stilp regarding the Statue of Liberty Anniversary***

Mr. Hartwick: It gives me great pleasure to honor an individual in our community who has stood out in many ways on many issues and many important topics. He has never been afraid to take on a challenge. I actually remember back when I was a young man, which was not too long ago, when I worked in the House Conservation Committee, I worked with Mr. Stilp on a number of issues. I know from the legislative pay raise to TMI to a number of issues that needed to be addressed, he has always been an individual who has been out in front and never afraid to take on a challenge. Today, we are here to have him honored for another historic landmark that actually exists in Dauphin County. During a time when we are debating about immigration and a number of other issues that happen to be at the top of everybody's focus and agenda, we are commemorating today the actual 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of a landmark that we always look for. I know my kids and my family, as we go down the Susquehanna, every time we come from Penn State or from northern Dauphin County the talk has always been where is the Statue of Liberty or did you see the Statue of Liberty. We know it was through the creation of Gene Stilp and a number of other folks who helped him along the road to create that Statue of Liberty, which in Dauphin County I think represents a diverse culture/diverse community. We have certainly a rural, suburban and urban area. That landmark represents a real presence in Central Pennsylvania. It lets the people know that we do stand for freedom, diversity and all different kinds of ideas, which makes us a stronger community.

Mr. Hartwick read the Proclamation.

*Office of County Commissioner*  
**Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

## Proclamation

*We, the Dauphin County Board of Commissioners, are delighted to join area motorists, history lovers and all patriotic Americans in hailing the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Lady Liberty, Dauphin County's own scaled-down version of New York Harbor's Statue of Liberty, which welcomes "your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;"*

*Whereas, this awe-inspiring replica caused quite a stir when it first appeared atop an old bridge in the Susquehanna River twenty years ago, the product of true leadership and deft behind-the-scenes organization by Gene Stilp and other ingenious organizers;*

*Whereas, the first statue, built from plywood and state-surplus Venetian blinds, remained in place for six years, but was destroyed by a windstorm in 1992;*

*Whereas, by 1997, supporters had collected enough money and donated materials to build a new statue constructed of fiberglass and coated metal;*

*Whereas, while the original weighed 450 pounds, the replacement weighed four tons and was airlifted in a much less covert manner than the original from Fort Hunter Park in Susquehanna Township;*

*Whereas, the statue has endured through many severe storms and floods, proving the power of freedom to stand firm in the face of evil and adversity;*

*Whereas, this statue remains one of the state's most loved and legendary landmarks;*

*Therefore, we join the 253,300 residents of Dauphin County in applauding the enduring presence and poignant message of Lady Liberty and her organizers; we wish the statue and those who made it possible a joyful 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary and many more years to come; and in honor and grateful recognition thereof, we do hereby proudly declare July 12, 2006 to be "Lady Liberty Forever Day" in Dauphin County.*

(Applause occurred.)

Mr. DiFrancesco: Probably many families share the same as what Commissioner Hartwick described as they are driving down through 322 and you look out and you try to find it and there she stands. There is a lot of fun that goes along with that. It is truly a testament. I thank you for your service and for taking stands and being willing to set aside and sacrifice your personal time in order to do things that make this area so much better. It is a delight to have you here today and of course the Statue is something that many of us really enjoy.

(Pictures were taken.)

Mr. Stilp: I accept this on behalf of everyone who participated. There were many individuals that helped and I thank you folks for presenting this to me. I really appreciate this honor.

(Applause occurred.)

**Steve Shaver, Director, Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency**  
*Review of Train Derailment*

Mr. DiFrancesco: We had a little bit of fun this week, luckily it was contained. Dangers were contained, however there were in fact a number of people displaced from their homes. Steve is here today to brief the Board on what took place. This, of course, serves as a reminder that while some of the things that we value in this area as our transportation network going through that makes our economy so great, there are certain dangers that come along with that.

Mr. Shaver: Last week the County, but more so Derry Township, experienced what could have been a very tragic accident down along the railroad tracks behind the American Legion. It was along and directly behind the Hershey Chocolate Factory. Not that it had anything to do with the factory or its operation, but basically that is where the train line runs. Cars rolled over and by the grace of God none of them spilled any of the materials that were in them. The good thing about this was it was a good exercise and a good will. The good relations between the County and all the local responders, because technically I received a page about a little after 5:00 p.m. and we already at that time had dispatched, who just happened to be one of the members of the Derry Township Board of Commissioners, Rick Lenker, who is actually the Haz Mat Officer for the County, to the scene of this incident. Along with that the County 911 Center also dispatched, as far as the first responders in that area, which is basically the Hershey Fire Company and Penn State University EMS to the scene too. They sized up the situation and immediately called for some assistance from neighboring communities. As far as the County is concerned we provided a support role during this whole time. This incident was actually under the control of Derry Township like the way it is supposed to be. It becomes a non-local incident when there is more than one geographical municipality involved. If we would have had to do evacuations, it could have become a County thing. I have to commend my staff as far as my Operations folks, Kevin Nelson who runs that group within our organization; Jack Harlacker and his crew as far as the Telecommunicators and the 911 Center, they did a superb job. The local folks, as far as Derry Township and all the other first responders that responded as far away as Hampden Township, plus we also had a vehicle there from Lancaster County as far as their mobile command center. The operation, if something could go off flawless it went out all flawless. The media was involved in the whole process. Our PR contacted him early on and we provided information, but it was reverted back to Derry Township because it was their incident. We would assist them in any case and in any way that they would want us to, but in most cases we try to refer them back to the municipalities. It was excellent training experience, even though it was a little nerve-racking for the folks that live there. Someone is going to have to pay a few dollars as far as the support that was necessary to bring in there. (Mr. Shaver had pictures to show of the derailment.) Photos were taken by a Hershey Foods professional photographer that they have on staff who was flying in Life Lion to take these particular pictures. Hershey allowed us to have this one photo. You can see as far as the cars that were involved. The one that was of most concern was the Tanker, which was loaded onto another car and was actually moved out of the area and taken to a facility in Delaware to be off loaded. The Potassium Hydroxide cars and the Carbon Dioxide cars

were a little less of an issue, but still was something to worry about. As far as a community in general, it was an excellent response as far as the first responders are concerned. I have to take my hat off to them. Are there any questions?

Mr. DiFrancesco: What caused it?

Mr. Shaver: It is still under investigation. The railroad themselves are doing an investigation plus the railroad industry has their own arm as far as investigations are concerned. Probably within a period of time they will actually kick out a report to us. We are within the responding agencies, they will probably do an after incident type of briefing at some point in time and try and pull different things together. We did a lot of video. One of the members of our staff was there and did some video photography. I'm also going to check with the media outlets if they would be kind enough to allow us to possibly get copies of the stuff that they shot at the scene. Derry Township did a great job. Chief Smith and Lt. Hall basically took care of the media on 12-hour shifts. They briefed them on an on-going basis and at no time, even though some of the citizens were displaced, they were well taken care of.

Mr. DiFrancesco: How many were displaced?

Mr. Shaver: About 14 people.

Mr. DiFrancesco: For how long?

Mr. Shaver: It was about two or three days until it was all said and done. The incident occurred on Wednesday and they got to back into their homes on Friday afternoon.

Mr. Hartwick: What caused the derailment?

Mr. Shaver: We don't know. Basically it is under investigation by Norfolk Southern. Normally as far as the National Transportation and Safety Administration does certain investigations, but they don't handle railroad, so the Railroad Industry actually has its own arm that basically goes out and does investigations. At this time we don't have any idea. Fortunately, they weren't moving at a rapid speed through that area. If you are familiar with it, it is down by...

Mr. Hartwick: I saw it the other day. That scares me. The idea of this thing occurring. What causes a derailment like this? Is it the tracks? There has to be some sort of scientific way...

Mr. Shaver: I believe we will get that. I'm a trained specialist, but not a "train" specialist. They are conducting an investigation and as soon as we get the results of that investigation we will provide them to you. The media on Friday contacted Diane as far as what travels in and out of the County at any given time. There was an article in the Patriot regarding that. We know in most cases as far as fixed facilities what we have to deal with. Our Haz Mat team is basically trained to deal with anything. That

can be this type of incident or it can also be as far as dirty bombs or terrorists are concerned. We have to be able to respond to that. The Haz Mat duty officer who is basically on call responds out to these incidents from this kind of thing to a meth lab to whatever.

Mr. Hartwick: What oversight is responsible for safety on the railroad?

Mr. Shaver: I would have to check for you, but I believe it is the Railway Safety Organization. I can get you the exact name if you want it. They were there on the scene. The other thing too is there is a financial burden, for the clean-up and also the fact that these tracks were down. With on time shipping Norfolk Southern is concerned, not only from the fact that they had to displace people and there could have been some danger involved with this incident, but also from another dollars and cents standpoint as far as what it cost them in revenue because of the fact that those tracks were not open.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm not as concerned about the revenues, but the public safety issue. You are talking about terrorism. This is a perfect way, next to houses that you can cause some disruption if you know how to do this.

Mr. Shaver: I know that our staff contacted particular agencies that we have to notify in certain incidents. This is a reportable incident as far as the State is concerned, as far as the Commonwealth's Emergency Operation Center. They were notified right away. In turn that kicks into gear certain particular agencies outside the State Government that actually comes to the scene. I can say that those particular folks were all on the scene.

Mr. Hartwick: It concerns me that we can't find out what caused this derailment.

Mr. Shaver: In most cases they are going to be cautious. If they knew that day what was wrong you know in most cases that they are going to step back and try to look at the whole thing. Was it just that particular thing? I'm not saying that they knew what caused this. Basically they are going to do an investigation. They are not going to try and jump to judgment. They want to come back with sound explanations as to what did happen.

Mr. Hartwick: Let us know when you get those explanations.

Mr. DiFrancesco: On behalf of the Board I would direct you to send out a letter to the appropriate body, whether it's National Transportation Safety Board or some subsidiary that deals specifically with, whoever the governmental unit is that oversees this and carbon copy our federal officials and FEMA requesting information and expressing our concern with the number of rail lines going through this area, I think we have a pretty good feel for the types of nasty stuff that is coming through here. We probably don't know it all, but we probably have a pretty good feel for most of it, expressing a desire to know that those lines are being inspected and to make sure that network is safe. The small building to the back of that photograph, when you talk about the needs for shipments to come in on a regular basis there are a lot of jobs on the line too that if

anything would happen and you had to shut that plant down that could be pretty significant to this area as well.

Mr. Shaver: The citizen impact could have been catastrophic, but as far as from the dollars and cents unfortunately we have to look at that too. The citizens always come first, but from dollars and cents you are absolutely right. Not only that but the close proximity to the park.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The transportation system in this area affects every single aspect of this community, like a coal truck that dumped off of a bridge. If this same incident had happened there and now all of a sudden we have canisters of nasty stuff floating down the Susquehanna River, environmentally the impact would be terrific. Our transportation system is just tightly woven into the fabric of this community. There is so much potential for danger. We want to make sure that proper inspections are being done and that safety is being ensured to the best of their ability and while emergencies by nature tend to happen when they are not planned for you can do an awful lot to make sure that only happens on that rare case. We have had three incidents that I can remember. There was the incident at the Rockville Bridge, this particular incident and the incident down at Middletown/Highspire. We need to make sure that these rail lines are maintained, being inspected and that our citizens have the assurance that we are trying to keep them as safe as possible. I would appreciate it if you could draft a letter on the Board's behalf and make sure they realize that.

Mr. Shaver: I will be happy to do that and will provide you with a copy before it goes out.

**Dan Robinson and George Connor from Economic Development**  
***Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Presentation***

Mr. Robinson: We are here this morning to give you an update on the Community Development Block Grant Program, which at least for the last three years has been undergoing some change in Dauphin County in terms of funding. (Mr. Robinson provided the Commissioners with a packet.) The median household income in Dauphin County stands at \$41,500, the median rent in the County is \$557.00 and the median mortgage is around \$1,000 per month.

Mr. Hartwick: Where is that in relation to other places in the State?

Mr. Robinson: In South Central Pennsylvania we are in tune with Cumberland, Lebanon and Lancaster Counties. In other counties to the East, Berks, Philadelphia, Allentown, we are seeing significantly higher rates obviously than what we are paying here. We are not upset on the mortgage rates, but obviously the income level is in the middle of the pack Statewide.

Our funding for Block Grant in 2003, you will see on Page 3 stood at \$1.879 million. In 2004 it was cut a little bit after an increase in 2002 and 2005 and 2006 largely due to

the hurricane in New Orleans. Everybody across the board took a hit and our current allocation is \$1.5 million.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Dan, on that slide the carry-over number, I assume that is what the...

Mr. Robinson: The arrow that you see down there on each line item is the decrease. We lost \$39,000 in 2004.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I just assumed that was the other portion that was the carryover or unspent dollars.

Mr. Robinson: From what we had and George can correct me on this we've carried around \$100,000 unprogrammed money, most of which has been spent since 2003 and 2004. We have some left from 2005 and 2006.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The decreases are disturbing when you consider what this money is used for in terms of water or sewer projects often for communities that have very limited financial resources. That is one issue, but the other issue that those communities have to realize is that money is going down and every community is going to be forced to find other ways to finance projects, because the demands and the requests keep going up and the dollars available keep going down.

Mr. Robinson: In this program as you said it is for typically distressed communities. It requires no local match unlike most state or federal programs. Even our county programs require a match. It is helpful to those communities.

Mr. Hartwick: Do we have a projection for the future direction of CDBG dollars, with your involvement and understanding of what has happened at the federal level for the past two years? We have been threatened and heard a number of things from the complete elimination of the CDBG program from the federal level to uncertainty as to what the levels are going to remain for counties. Do you have a federal update as it relates to the direction of future funding?

Mr. Robinson: The first slide on the presentation, the battle continues. Every year we are writing to Senator Santorum, Senator Spector and President Bush to try to make sure that this funding stays. I would say it is going to continue to be a battle. It seems like every time there is a blip on the federal radar screen, whether it is a war, hurricane or disaster, the pot of money they are looking to cut is the block grant money.

Mr. Hartwick: In this year's budget discussions, has there been specific numbers that have been discussed as it relates to reductions, increases or any ideas about what the County's allocation may be this year?

Mr. Connor: Every year we don't know what our allocation is going to be, because with Congress, until they do their appropriations bill and it is signed, we don't know what the allocation will be until maybe December. This year they always tell us to estimate what

we received last year. We are going to receive about \$1.552 million. For 2007, we just had our deadline date for the applications, which was Monday, July 10<sup>th</sup> and we received over 30 applications with the funding request of over \$2.79 million. So, obviously we are not going to be able to help assist every one again this year.

Mr. Hartwick: One of the good things that happened in the County was when we reached the urban county status, when we went over the population of 250,000. I remember this when I was Mayor, we received an additional allocation. We went from \$1.4 million to the \$1.89 million.

Mr. Robinson: Actually I did make a note on that. In 2001, the County had \$625,000 to dole out, which is even more limited. I think the Borough of Steelton had \$85,000. Now we are at a higher level than it was before, but still we do have to fight for it every year. It appears to be a political football in terms of who...

Mr. Hartwick: Projections this year have us at the current funding level of \$1.55 million. We have \$2.7 million in projects requested and are expecting only to receive \$1.55 million, which leaves us with approximately \$1.2 million of projects that cannot be funded. In whatever way, we need to begin and be more active in tracking what is happening on the federal level to ensure what our allocation is going to be. We need to stay on that.

Mr. Robinson: I know Commissioner Haste had directed us previously to fully inform the Board on the projects that we present. Are they one time projects or are they asking for funding of \$100,000 for the next ten years, which we can't guarantee. I know if we start a project we want to finish it and preferably do it in the first phase.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I want to make sure that the groups that come in and submit their applications understand where we are very clearly and how this money is getting tighter and tighter, because I know a lot of groups come in here with high expectations that they will receive funding for their project. They need to understand that this pot is dwindling. Again, as I said earlier, communities are going to be forced to find new ways to raise money internally. Often times these are sewer and water projects so tapping fees and new developments would assist in reconstruction of sewer lines. These communities need to be aware that this pot is slowly being eliminated.

Mr. Hartwick: From an educational standpoint, we should talk about if the dollars are not going as far how we leverage this money even with borrowing some money to be able to invest in these capital improvements that are necessary for municipalities, instead of thinking that the County is now going to come and provide you all the money. Some of the responsibility is going to rest on local municipalities to find other ways to use this money to leverage and creatively finance the rest of the project and not rely on all CDBG dollars to do so. We should provide a little bit of training to the local municipalities and let them know if these are a ten year plan of what you want to get accomplished and how much the allocations are. You have to actually start to think of some creative ways to look at financing.

Mr. Robinson: I would say that it is unlikely that it will go away due to the hundreds of municipalities around the country that have loans against this pot of money, which we are also entering into with Advanced Communications and we are talking to some other companies and businesses throughout the County. I don't think the pot is going away, it will be a continual fight to maintain or increase the fund.

Mr. Connor: Currently we do not require a match for our projects. I think maybe we need to consider a match.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Projects that come in with a local match associated with them are viewed better or stronger than projects that don't have a local match. It is very hard for me in particular to see a project come in on a sewer or water project knowing that there is an authority backing this up and knowing that there are revenues coming in on a regular basis, with no local match. I know the expectations aren't great because these are distressed communities. There has to be some local match associated if they want us to take it seriously to fund it.

Mr. Hartwick: They could do revenue generating bonds, do things that are low interest and they will have a revenue stream to come in to help pay for the capital improvements and use this money to borrow and pick up the pieces to the project. I just think their understanding of public finance may need to be brushed up.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think Commissioner Hartwick was right on the money that if we can go out and meet with them and try to bring that bigger vision and train them a little bit better on how to flex their money to get the most out of it. That probably is a good idea. A lot of these communities again would not have strong backgrounds in that area.

Mr. Robinson: Again, what we have tried to do is steer our municipalities, non-profits and governmental entities towards economic development as a priority for funding, public service projects and then as you alluded to public infrastructure with sewer and water and some other issues.

In 2003/2006 approximately 140 applications were received. There were one hundred from municipalities and 40 from non-profit agencies. The requests totaled over \$6.7 million. Again when we say on the next slide ten least affluent communities that is based on the low and moderate income wage. It does not mean that there is any stigma attached to that, but you can see those listed below. Again our ten most affluent communities based on the low and moderate wage. South Hanover is at the top and Lower Swatara down towards the bottom. That keeps changing on a yearly basis. Meeting priorities for economic development we had eleven grants awarded, 23 public service projects and 46 public infrastructure projects. Some of them are listed in the packet. Pillow Borough had a water storage tank. There was a leak and solely due to the County's assistance we were able to do that. The Friendship Center recently in Lower Paxton Township put on an addition to their senior center. Here are some of the projects that you are well aware of that the County, through your efforts and some of the

income criteria, definitely more than half goes to the upper quadrant of the County. Again, some of the township municipalities are changing in terms of their low/mod wage, which is a good thing, but it is also good that we can support them. Berrysburg, as well as, Millersburg we did a water facility project replacement. Millersburg Senior Citizen, as part of a block grant, seniors are exempt from the low/mod criteria. The Board has prioritized where they should be. Targeting funding, 35% of the funds go to the ten least affluent communities, 4% have gone to the 10% most affluent communities, which is probably the correct way to fund that. 51% of the funds go to the middle of the pack. We are pretty much bound by Federal statute on how we direct this funding. You pick the projects based on the criteria, but we wanted to give the Board an update as the process moves forward. You probably will be hearing from some of your local municipalities on their priorities and doing their selective lobbying as needed.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This is good information, but I would strongly suggest that as you are communicating with the people that are going to be coming in to present their programs and packages I for one will be very interested in hearing how they are going to use this money to somehow improve their economic stance so that next year they don't have to ask for as much money. Again, a lot of times the infrastructure projects should overlap economic development. The stronger they make a particular line going out to more developable land, it gives them an opportunity to invest the money wisely. I know that's not what it is designed for, because often times what we see are applications for sewer lines that collapse and are literally in need of emergency repair. There is no money available. The stronger applications will be the ones that basically say that we are trying to improve our community, trying to make it better so we don't have to rely on this money so much and here is what we would like to do.

Mr. Hartwick: Did Hummelstown submit an application?

Mr. Connors: I didn't see one. I'll have to double check. I totaled them up but didn't check to see who responded. I did talk to Mike.

Mr. Hartwick: The only other population, besides the elderly, that is able to avoid the criteria for the social and economic demographics that need to be in place are the handicapped. For everybody else they need to meet the low/moderate income guidelines.

**Eric Hershey from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.**

*Status of MDJ Postelle's Office #12-2-05, Rolleston St., Harrisburg*

Mr. Hershey: A quick status update on Judge Postelle's Office. We are getting very close to the end. We have the City inspection for our occupancy permit which is actually occurring today. HRG will do our final fit and finish inspection on July 17<sup>th</sup>. We will go through with the contractors and representatives from the Court for their substantially complete inspection on the 24<sup>th</sup>. Judge Postelle will be moving into the office from July 26<sup>th</sup> through the 31<sup>st</sup>. His first day of court will be August 1.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Which I am sure will make him extremely happy.

Mr. Hershey: Yes. We are very close to the end. I know the Commission wanted me to talk a little bit about some of the change orders that are remaining. The one that you are dealing with right now is Work Change Order #5 to the electrical contract. In my conversations with Chad, that was perhaps some things our sub consultant missed in his design. We are going to stand behind that and we are going to reimburse the County for that change order. That will be a no cost change. We don't have a contract with the contractor so we will have to work that through the County. You guys will pay the contractor and we will in turn reimburse the County for that change. There is a potential for one more. It should be very minor. I was called out the Monday after the big rainstorm, the one that caused all the flooding. They thought that a sink hole had opened up. I went out and looked at it and did some excavation and exploratory digging and determined that it really wasn't a sink hole. Some of the soil had given way just because it was so wet. We are still haggling with the contractor whether he is responsible for that or not. At most it is just a few thousand dollars. It was about an hour of his time with the equipment, a backhoe and they poured some concrete in the spot that sunk. We are looking for a few yards of concrete, a couple hours of backhoe time and that is it.

Mr. Hartwick: A couple thousand dollars for an hour.

Mr. Hershey: He was digging the hole for an hour and an hour to fill it back in and three to four yards of concrete.

Mr. Hartwick: Besides the \$2,000 change we should be expecting one more.

Mr. Hershey: At most.

Mr. Hartwick: Is that on the record? (It was indicated yes.) I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Sometimes I think one of the most difficult jobs in County government is building a court facility because it takes a long time and tends to be a technically engineered project.

Mr. Hershey: The State keeps mandating more and more security features. You look at this tiny little building and you think what is so complicated about it. It is the security features that really make it tricky. The devils and the details are exactly true in this case.

Mr. Hartwick: I think you have done a good job managing the project. We had some major concerns with cost overruns. We stayed on your butt pretty hard. I didn't see a whole lot of problems, with the exception of the soil and a few pieces here and there. It was a very well run project and you should be commended.

**James Nettles from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.**  
*Flood inspections of Dauphin County Bridges*

Mr. Nettles: On Friday, June 30<sup>th</sup>, HRG was requested by Dauphin County to perform a cursory inspection of three Dauphin County bridges to assess damage from the recent flooding. Those bridges that we looked at that day were Bridge #1, Fiddlers Elbow Bridge over Swatara Creek in Derry Township, Bridge #32, North Duke Street over Swatara Creek in the Borough of Hummelstown and Bridge #122, Hanover Street over Swatara Creek in South Hanover and Derry Townships. All three of these bridges were closed due to the flooding to vehicular traffic by local municipalities. They were closed at the time of the inspection. Due to the high water that was still present on June 30<sup>th</sup>, we were only able to stay on the surface of the bridges. We were not able to go into the water underneath the bridges.

On Bridge #1, which is the Fiddlers Elbow Bridge, that is a four-span adjacent box beam bridge constructed in 1973. We did not see any signs of new damage, structural damage or distress due to the flooding. However, there was a significant amount of debris lodged on the upstream side of pier #2 and also under spans 2 and 3. At that time we had contacted Derry Township's Director of Public Works, Tom Clark, to let him know that the bridge was structurally sound and that it could be open to traffic that day. I believe it was open right after we left.

The next bridge that we looked at was #32, the North Duke Street in Hummelstown. That is a five-span masonry arch bridge built in 1910. This bridge based on our findings had debris lodged in the bridge railings. Approximately two-thirds of that bridge was under water during the flood. As a result of that water over the deck, a significant amount of the asphalt deck surface was damaged. It was cracked and several pot holes had resulted especially on the northern half of the bridge. Again, no new signs of structural damage were seen at that time. However, due to the submersion of the bridge, the earth fill that lies between the roadway surface and the top of the arch was completely saturated. At the time of our inspection it was still draining. This saturation of the soil would add extra weight to the bridge. That bridge is already currently posted at a weight restriction of 8 tons. We had contacted the Borough Manager, Mike O'Keefe, to let him know that we would like the bridge to stay closed until the following Wednesday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, at which time we would come back out. We did reassess the drainage of the bridge. At that time, the bridge was still draining along the arches. We were able to get under spans 1 and 2 at that point and water was still leaking through the barrels, the undersides of the arch. In an email to Mr. O'Keefe our recommendation was to keep the bridge closed for the remainder of that week to allow for more drainage and it could be reopened that Monday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, assuming that the debris from the asphalt wearing surface on the bridge is removed and the pot holes are temporarily patched. As far as I know the bridge was opened on the 10<sup>th</sup> at our direction. Also at that bridge basically the whole upper portion of the bridge from piers 1, 2 and 3 were blocked with a large amount of debris. I believe this bridge, historically, accumulates debris on every high water occasion. The bridge is still structurally sound, but repairs are needed on that bridge especially to the bridge deck.

The third bridge that we looked at that day was Bridge #122, Hanover Street. That is a three-span reinforced concrete closed arch bridge built in 1920. Baseline information

given to us by Mr. Clark from Derry Township was that only the end portions of the bridge were submerged during flooding. It did not sustain the same soil saturation as the Duke Street Bridge. There were no signs of leaking on that bridge and there were no other signs of structural problems or distress noted. However, there was some debris accumulation on the nose of pier #2 on that bridge as well. Actually, Mr. Clark was on site with us at that bridge and he accompanied us during that inspection. After the inspection we informed him that he could open the bridge to traffic that day.

Currently, on behalf of the County, we are preparing an emergency contract to remove flood debris and also to repair the deck on the Duke Street Bridge. We had set out a request for quotes from three local contractors to do this work. The quotes are due back to us on July 14<sup>th</sup>; at which time we will review the quotes and submit to the County for their approval.

Mr. Hartwick: Do you have any anticipated costs for the removal of the debris or the repair of the deck?

Mr. Nettles: For the removal of the debris, based on the 2004 flooding, I estimated...

Mr. Hartwick: Is there only two bridges that need debris removed?

Mr. Nettles: All three need debris removed.

Mr. Hartwick: Is that something that requires a special service or can we send Edgar down to kick the stuff away?

Mr. Nettles: Most of the time it requires a large excavator that can actually reach over the sides of the bridge down to the channel to remove the debris. Some times the workers are lowered down on to the pile of debris to cut pieces of wood and lift it up. It is a significant amount of work.

Mr. Hartwick: It would be nice to see if there is any way that we can offset some of the costs with our maintenance folks. It has been this Board's practice in the past to try to do that with every other project.

Mr. Nettles: For the flood debris removal, we had estimated approximately \$50,000 total for all three bridges and for the deck repair another \$25,000.

Mr. Hartwick: I can understand the deck repair is something that you have to deal with.

Mr. Saylor: After Ivan I thought we had some trustees doing some work.

Mr. Hartwick: I'm just trying to think about ways to offset costs in the removal without putting people's lives in jeopardy. I would like to see if you could explore that option of either maintenance or trustees.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Can you share with us what was sent out, like an RFP document to the companies?

Mr. Nettles: I actually have a copy.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Can you share that with the Board so we can see the type of work that is required?

Mr. Nettles: Yes.

(Mr. DiFrancesco and Mr. Hartwick reviewed the document.)

Mr. Hartwick: If you could explore those options before we actually do anything with accepting the bids.

Mr. Nettles: We will do that.

## **SALARY BOARD**

Minutes of the Salary Board are on file in the Commissioners' Office.

## **PERSONNEL**

Ms. Sinner: In the Personnel Transactions, I have a list of several positions that we are requesting permission to fill. Item #2, I'm requesting a vote be taken today because there are some hires that are filling at least one of those vacancies. Spring Creek has several hires that they are starting July 17<sup>th</sup>, because that is when their orientation is scheduled, so I would like to request a vote on those hires today. Actually, New Hire #11 I'm going to pull. She will not be starting. New Hires #12 through #17, I'm going to request a vote on. Also #19 I would like to request a vote on. In the Personnel Changes #20 that Caseworker is the one that will be working as Casework Supervisor temporarily, that is her transfer. Those are the items to be voted on today. Are there any questions?

Mr. Hartwick: When you get a chance can you give me some details on #22 and also #27 to #43?

Ms. Sinner: They are change in job titles?

Mr. Hartwick: What is all of that?

Ms. Sinner: As we were entering job descriptions in the Access Program, we became aware that a lot of departments were calling the positions something different than what we had on our payroll system. Now, we are correcting them in our payroll system.

Mr. Hartwick: So, this has nothing to do with salary, nothing to do with changing job description, just a change in title.

Ms. Sinner: Yes, just a change in title. This provides documentation of the change.

Mr. Hartwick: It says it is going from position to the next position seems to be the exact same name.

Ms. Sinner: Some of them like in the case of the maintenance workers that are now Park maintenance workers.

Mr. Hartwick: It just includes Park.

Ms. Sinner: Some of these we have to move the people into new position numbers because we still have maintenance worker 3's that work in Facilities Maintenance that you have to distinguish between.

Mr. Hartwick: This is just to clean up.

Ms. Sinner: Yes, it is. Some of the title changes are a little different. Adult Probation had a lot of specific titles which now they are grouping under the title of Adult Probation Supervisor. I actually have more that I will be putting through the next meeting, because I'm not all the way through the list.

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve Item #2 under Request to Post/Fill Vacancies, Items #12, #13, #14, #15, #16, #17 and #19 under New Hires and Item #20 under Personnel Changes; motion carried.**

## **PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci: You should have received your Packet yesterday. As usual, there are a few budgetary adjustments that need to be made. Other than that, if you have any questions on the Packet I will be happy to try to answer them.

There was a question by our Chief Clerk on Page 4 about two vehicles for Security. Basically Mr. Pries said that he has two vehicles that are very old and are breaking down and costing a lot of money for repairs. He had money in his budget to acquire two new ones at a fairly reasonable cost of \$11,200 a piece. That is what those items are.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I wanted to note for the record the Spring Creek purchases. While we are in transition the things that are on here are obviously necessary. There is a steamer for vegetables and both our steamers are not working so we obviously have to be providing food services. The DVD player is the one that really stood out. That is from the Staff Development Office. They need it for training purposes.

Mr. Hartwick: One thing that you may be seeing soon is a line item about photo processing for child abuse that is needed for the year \$4,000. Children and Youth is getting a legal opinion to see if they are able to start to use digital cameras, because now how it works they have to take 35 mm pictures, have three or four pictures on that roll developed, which wastes the film and development costs and then present to the judge. We are looking at trying to buy a significant number of digital cameras to replace all the 35 mm, because it is a much more efficient way of doing business over there. I wanted to explain that before it gets on the agenda.

Mr. Baratucci: Are there any restrictions with Spring Creek as far as purchasing items that are necessary? We should just continue to process them until... I'm assuming that is the direction.

Mr. DiFrancesco: If you see something that really doesn't make sense. I would expect everybody to question the purchases at this point, but I think staff is pretty much... Right now they are buying what they need to buy. They won't be making any greater purchases other than what they need to buy. In the transition there may be some serious maintenance items that come through that we absolutely have to repair before we turn keys over. Unfortunately that is just a nature of transferring the assets.

Mr. Baratucci: If maintenance agreements come up for renewal, because they come up at different times during the year, a lot of them are January 1, but some or not, I assume you just want to continue to maintain those and that there is some program in place to transfer all of that when it happens. Whatever agreements are in place?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm not sure what official, maybe Bill can answer this, but I'm sure that our vendors are now being notified and that all the contracts are being reviewed in terms of when we ultimately are no longer responsible for the building. Again if a contract would happen to come up and it is a 12-month contract and we have to keep it going month-to-month in order to get out...

Mr. Hartwick: I don't want to renew these contracts and spend money for the entire year if this company should be taking over the bill for this.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Obviously the new company may or may not want to work with the same vendors that the County was working with.

Mr. Tully: Generally what they would do is assume the ongoing operation, all the liabilities as well as the assets. Essentially there should be a dialogue at least set up where they have the option before we renew it as to how they would like us to do it. Essentially just because we contract with them and do the sale, we are not going to be responsible for those contracts once they are receiving the benefits and assume the liabilities on it. We will take a closer look at it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would assume too, because technically we are going out of business and most of these contracts would be written with out clauses that basically say the reason is because we are no longer in the business.

Mr. Tully: I think it would be a good idea for us to coordinate with the purchasers just to make sure. It is in our mutual interest to make sure that dialogue is there.

Mr. Hartwick: Could you get a list of contracts together?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm sure the legal team has that because that is all stuff that has to go through with the transition. That would be good to see.

Mr. Hartwick: I hope we don't have too many replacements. Let them pay for it.

### **TRAINING PACKET**

Mr. DiFrancesco: Anything on the training packet that needs to be addressed?

Mr. Saylor: It would appear that we need to approve Items #1, #2 and #3 because they seem to take place before the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Hartwick: I have a concern that they didn't get here on time.

Mr. Saylor: Particularly Item #1. They have all been approved and most of them are mandated training programs.

Mr. Hartwick: They should still have the requests in on time.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The first one was an omission. That name was omitted. It was just an error. The second two appear to be late. I'm not sure the details behind them.

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick, as long as the directors are notified that if they don't send their requests in before we need a vote in a Workshop, and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve Items #1, #2 and #3 on the Training Packet; motion carried.**

(It was noted after the meeting that the reason they are late is because there was no Commissioners' Meeting on July 5<sup>th</sup> and that the requests were received shortly after the June 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting.)

### **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- A. Ratify a renewal of a Pennsylvania Commission on Crime & Delinquency (PCCD) Firm Works Grant administered through the Dauphin County Adult Probation Office. **(\*\*\*A VOTE IS REQUESTED 7/12/06)**

Rev. Tilly: Thanks for the opportunity to be able to present this renewal of the Firm Works Grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime & Delinquency. This is the third year of a three-year grant from PCCD that we have used to run our Firm Works Life Skills and Re-entry Skills Training Program with the Dauphin County Work Release Center and the Dauphin County Adult Probation and Parole. These are pass through funds that come from PCCD to the County and they pass through to our organization to run the program. The total budget is around \$133,000 and this is a provision of \$33,334 of those funds to provide re-entry services for about 40 inmates at the Dauphin County Work Release Center annually. The Dauphin County Adult Probation and Parole provides an in-kind match of a van and a maintenance worker that works along with our construction director. We rehab properties mostly in the South Allison Hill neighborhood through the Weed and Seed initiative there. We are pleased with the progress that we have made with the gentleman who participated in our Firm Works Program and would like to have continued support of this pass through grant.

Mr. Hartwick: First of all there is no County General Fund dollars being used for the project?

Rev. Tilly: That is correct.

Mr. Hartwick: And after this year runs out of the three-year grant are they anticipating that you pick this up fully or is there another opportunity to reapply? What is the status of this program following the end of this year?

Rev. Tilly: They are anticipating that we pick it up fully and our sustainability plans are in place and we are on track to do that. We paid about half of the cost last year and this year we will be paying two-thirds of the cost and next year we will be paying the entire cost through funds other than PCCD.

Mr. Hartwick: And you generate the revenue through the resale of houses?

Rev. Tilly: Yes, we have denominations that support what we are doing. Faith based groups and individuals who give to us. We also do have a for profit entity that we own, but we own all the stocks in it and they build new homes and those homes are sold on the open market and the profit that is generated there helps fund what we are doing. We do get some grant funds from the U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and also from private foundations.

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board ratify a renewal of a Pennsylvania Commission on Crime & Delinquency (PCCD) Firm Works Grant administered through the Dauphin County Adult Probation Office; motion carried.**

## **REPORT FROM SOLICITOR – WILLIAM TULLY, ESQ.**

Mr. Tully: I have nothing to add as you can see it is that time of year where the Human Services Contracts seem to dominate the horizon, which is the nature of the fiscal set-up. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Hartwick: I will get with you after the meeting to get some information on some of the contracts.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Things are moving along nicely. I just want to give a plug to keep the lease applications going for the radio communication project, because now that we are in the heart of the radio project, obviously the one thing that really puts us behind budget and schedule is if those sites are not ready to go when they are ready to start building. I will plug that over the next three years to make sure we keep on track. I know we have run into some minor challenges on some of the locations and want to make sure that we are doing everything we can to move that forward and using the resources of the County to make sure that everybody has what they need to push it over. We need to start constructing on some of those sites.

## **REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK – CHAD SAYLOR**

Mr. Saylor: I have nothing for you unless you have questions of me.

## **COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

(There was none.)

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. DiFrancesco: We've reached the point in the meeting for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board? (There was none.)

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board adjourn.**

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor  
Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

Transcribed by: Richie-Ann Martz

printed 10/09/06