



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONERS' WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17, 2005

10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff; Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Lowell Witmer, Clerk of Courts; Carolyn Thompson, Esq., Court Administrator; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Edgar Cohen, Facility Maintenance Director; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office; Diane McNaughton, Commissioners' Office; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office; Dave Schreiber, Personnel Office; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Dan Robinson, Economic Director; Skip Memmi, Economic Development; Sandy Moore, Human Services Director; and Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Daniel J. Malpezzi, Esq., McNees, Wallace & Nurick; Fred Fetter, Pinnacle Health; Chris Markley, Pinnacle Health

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 four sets of Minutes that we'll take up next week.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

TEFRA HEARING

(A complete set of the Minutes is on file in the Commissioners' Office.)

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Mr. Haste: We are honored to have the Clerk of Courts, Lowell Witmer, with us today.

A. Lowell Witmer, Clerk of Courts

1. Request to hire temporary staff to help with the court automation.

Mr. Witmer: It was suggested that I address some specific concerns related to the state-wide judicial automation project. I've prepared a brief statement.

"In the early 90's I was asked to represent the Pennsylvania Clerk of Courts on the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts or (AOPC) Committee to devise and implement a state-wide unified judicial system. Primarily for lack of funding and after years of planning this monumental effort was abandoned but not forgotten by a new state law providing for assessment to court cases that were deposited into a judicial computer system augmentation account. The endeavor resurfaced as the Common Pleas Project.

In August of 2000, I was again asked to participate and accepted an appointment by Supreme Court Justice Steven Zappella. As the project evolved, it became known as the Common Pleas Court Management System or CPCMS. Virtually, every component of the Judicial System was represented and ranged from judges, court administrators, clerk of courts and members of the Bar Association. Monthly, two day work sessions

were scheduled and joint application development committees were created to cover the functionality of the Common Pleas System.

The crux of CPCMS would be automation. Through the use of a computerization process, procedures would be streamlined and integrated so as to make all judicial districts compatible with each other. With limited room for local practice, processing bail, commitments, appeals, costs & fines, and other court management procedures would be constant throughout the state. The system will also provide a standard approach to forms, fees, and docket entries. It will also interface with the already automated Pennsylvania Appellate Court Management System and several other state-wide court related information systems.

In the Spring of 2003, three pilot counties were developed into test sites for the new system. Twenty more counties were added prior to a pause in 2004. The system reached a crisis stage and implementation had to be halted to address much needed upgrades and revisions. After several months, the roll-out continued and as of today 46 counties are utilizing the CPCMS. By the end of the year the AOPC expects 63 counties on-line.

Once the system is activated, there is no going back. The push to move forward was part of the crisis that led to the pause. Essentially, the transition consists of unplugging one system and plugging in another. Perhaps, the most critical part of the transition is the data migration. Over the past several months, several meetings and discussions have taken place between my office, the AOPC and Dauphin County Office of Information Technology. Numerous other work sessions have taken place involving the Clerk of Court staff and the AOPC in their office in Mechanicsburg to dissect and evaluate information and procedures. Still more meetings have and are taking place between court related offices in Dauphin County. With no doubt, crunch time is just around the corner. Other counties have recently implemented CPCMS and found it necessary to supplement their staff in order to keep pace with the extraordinary demands of this effort. Despite extra staff and overtime, backlogs were still the norm. My office is scheduled to go live on October 10. Prior to going live, there will be three weeks of extensive hands-on-training which will require a substantial amount of out-of-office time for my staff. In addition as part of the closeout process, my current system will be deactivated three days prior to this go live date at which time all duties and responsibilities will have to be performed manually and subsequently entered into the system after it is activated. Also, there will be a substantial learning curve that is expected to last two-three months. During this time period beginning with the training on September 19, I am requesting your approval for three temporary staff positions to assist the Clerk of Courts Office during our transition to the CPCMS. I believe there is sufficient funding available under consulting services in my budget to offset the cost associated with these positions without having any adverse impact on the County's overall budget. With your help and support of countless others, I am determined to make CPCMS a success story for Dauphin County." Are there any questions?

Mr. Haste: This is actually a salary board item. Marie, hopefully what Lowell was saying was addressed to you, also.

I asked Richie to get Tom Guenther. Have you worked with Tom?

Mr. Witmer: Very close.

Mr. Haste: One of the things that just popped into my mind as you were speaking, we have a need for temporary help in your office and I just had a discussion yesterday we also have a need to address some computerization issue in the Public Defender's Office. Is there any way we can hire the same staff and do both projects, making yours the priority? Maybe instead of hiring three people to do yours and two to do his, if we hired four temporary, is there a way to move some of this automation at the same time?

Mr. Witmer: I would say that I'm under very specific time constraints right now and they are in stone.

Mr. Haste: I said yours would be priority.

Mr. Witmer: You're saying, if they were done in my office?

Mr. Haste: I just want to find out if there is any way we could do both at the same time. I don't know.

Mr. Witmer: I would guess not. That is just my educated guess on what we are trying to do based on experience of other counties and what they've had. Even with this, there are still backlogs of weeks and months of getting things into the court. Backlog is kind of a dirty name in the court system. We can't afford.....

Mr. Haste: It may be a dirty word but there isn't a single function that there isn't a backlog.

Mr. Witmer: The example I always get, is putting somebody in jail and getting them out of jail. It can't be messed up or delayed or toyed with. I don't know what is involved in George's proposal. I'll work with you.

Mr. Haste: Part of it is to do the exact same thing, that is to make sure we get people out of jail as quick as we can because the more I look at the prison population, the more of it is the function of the system not being as efficient as it can be all the way across.

Mr. Hartwick: I remember and I tried to talk to a few folks about this that are directors of mine. What about the novel concept of having folks.....this is basically data entry stuff. Are there things that are beyond data entry for these folks?

Mr. Witmer: I would say, you mean as far as the positions that I have?

Mr. Hartwick: The three part-time positions. Are you looking for folks to do the data entry work?

Mr. Witmer: Yes, the most simplistic of things because we don't have the time to train them on high tech stuff. This is to keep pace while my staff is being trained.

Mr. Hartwick: That was always a concern. I remember when I used to work for the Treasury Department, when there were issues that were critical with data entry. Is there any way we can identify employees to be able.....that may be under utilized to be able to go over and do the data entry work that is needed to be done rather than us going out and getting some temporary employees. If we could identify employees that we currently have that are computer literate and be able to do some of the data entry that are being under utilized....transfer them into your department to be able to give you full utilization of them until your project is done. I was thinking about the same thing even in the Public Defender's Office.

Mr. Haste: Quite frankly, what the PD is doing, he is taking two attorneys to do data entry work.

Mr. Hartwick: We could do sort of an assessment and ask the directors to come up with one or two people out of their staff to dedicate them to do data entry full-time.

Mr. Haste: I know the departments well and no one is going to sit there and say, I've got excess capacity. They cry the other way every chance they get.

Mr. Hartwick: Yes, but there are times and cycles when things are critical like in Tax Claim for example. Right now we've got a sale coming up which those folks are extremely busy. When that sale is over, things settle down. They are able to move into those providing help in those departments. It is a shame. We need to have directors manage their departments to understand when those high times of volume are and be able to allow them to allocate other individuals for a purposes like this. We're supposed to be one big team here not competing against each other.

Mr. Haste: I agree. Mr. Guenther could you come forward? Lowell is asking for temporary help to do data entry for his automation. You and I had a conversation and we have the same thing with the Public Defender's Office. Instead of each department hiring temporary folks what we were talking about doesn't make sense. I said to hire temporary folks to do all of this automation at one time under your guidance or whatever and do all this data entry that we need to do to get caught up. Commissioner Hartwick also suggested that maybe we ought to find employees who are under utilized at the present time in their department to help do that. My question to you is, does it make any sense to look at doing them all at once or are they so different that we couldn't....bring in five clerks whether they're from a temp agency or somewhere else or all employees and do all these automations at once or must they be done as separate projects?

Mr. Guenther: A lot of these projects aren't going to be happening at the same time but we are going to have some cross over. The concern that I have in the Courts, if we are talking about just bringing in some short-term temporary help, we've got to find people who understand some of the court processes and court terminology. You're looking at somebody that just got a 4-6 week assignment to get through a data entry crunch. I'm not sure that we're going to be able to build that kind of expertise.

Mr. Haste: He's not looking for that I understand.

Mr. Guenther: Not in his case, that's some of the confusion that we've been having in the Public Defender's Office where we have to get somebody that can understand the crime codes, get them off of some of their old records and get them into their new data system making an affect a case management tool for them. That is one of the reasons why we were looking more towards some of the law school seniors. Somebody that might want a temporary internship or even going with a paralegal that could come in, understand that and really start working with the office staff and transitioning their process. That is a little bit different skill than just going and getting temporary help to get through the short-term crunch. I think in Lowell's case when we look at the new Court Common Pleas System, he's got office staff that really have to learn their system and are going to have that knowledge and expertise as they go through that transition. He needs some bodies just in the immediate crunch to go over the new system and maintain normal court operations. Once we get that knowledge transfer into the office, I think you will see the workload decrease. I don't think we need to have court expertise in that area. We just need some bodies in that transition period. So there is a combination.

Mr. Haste: You need two different skill levels.

Mr. Guenther: Right. The real thing and I don't think we have a handle on it at this point in time, with the way the Court of Common Pleas solution is coming in and you're talking about existing county resources, there are going to be things that are going to be changed within the court operations. A lot of what is happening from the AOPC level is a shift and more processes are being moved into Court Administration. Traditionally some of those court operations have been handled by the District Attorney's Office. For instance, court scheduling. Now you're going to be looking at the Court Administration having to do some things in the court scheduling area that they have to be part of that process which might take reallocation of resources. We're going to have to work with those departments on how they work with the system and what personnel they need. That really hasn't occurred yet because we don't know the full process and the full effect of what the state system is going to do to us. There is going to be some changes in the court rules and the judges are going to have to look at all that. I can see that we could have a sharing of resources. We could have limited resources. We might be able to take existing personnel and do them. His request is really just on that short-term help and get through the financial entry of these cases. From what we are hearing from the other counties that have gone live on the system, the biggest challenge has been the financial portion of the court system. That's why he is looking to get this short-term

block of help for. I think we're going to have to have further discussion on the full operation of court and the resources we need as those processes change.

Mr. Haste: I'm just trying to minimize resources.

Mr. Hartwick: CCAP is providing us with a grant to try to bring in somebody for the Public Defender's Office, is that individual going to be an attorney or is that individual going to be an I.T. person that is responsible for data entry?

Mr. Guenther: What I have worked out right now and I talked with George Shultz and Paul Mueller in the last two days. CCAP gave us some grant money to do some of that data entry to get the Case Management System up and running and help move their office along. What we are looking at doing with some of that grant money is just to get a body in that CCAP has available to us to do some of that data entry. I don't look at that person as having any of the legal court related knowledge that is going to be able to transfer that knowledge into their office environment and change their business practice.

Mr. Haste: So you are saying it is very similar to what Lowell is looking for?

Mr. Guenther: That is correct.

Mr. Hartwick: That is my point, the idea of doing the data entry doesn't require an attorney as you suggested. That is why I said we need some people in there to be able to do data entry. You need an attorney there because there is some confidential information that can't get outside of that realm but as long as they have somebody there sort of a check and guide and managing the process. What needs to be done is records just need to be inputted into the system.

Mr. Guenther: They do but there are some business decisions that have to be made as they are entering data. The crimes codes are done in a certain way and they have to get entered consistently into the system. They also have to look at how are we going to use that software to assist our office staff and make it more efficient in their office. The data entry person that is coming in to enter that data is not going to be making those decisions. From what I've been seeing, it is very difficult for Paul Mueller to get a lot of time to focus on that. That is why we were looking at maybe using some of that grant money, not just for data entry, but also more from a technical legal aspect to come in and transition that office staff into better utilizing the automation tools.

Mr. Hartwick: But they'll never be able to get to that point if they have to go back and enter the past three years of all the records which I'm aware they need to. They're never going to get to that point until that information is entered. Then they can make those determinations on how they are going to be able to use the software and the management tools that are going to be afforded to them after this thing is up and running. But they need to get the information in so we need to get people to be able to input that information in that position. That is the whole problem. They have not had time to have anybody do the work.

Mr. Haste: Then why can't we have....now you are saying something different than what you said before. To me it sounds like, what I'm hearing now in the PD's Office you need two levels. You need someone with some legal expertise and then you need just a body to do data entry.

Mr. Hartwick: A few bodies would be appropriate.

Mr. Haste: Is there any way to coordinate that with what Lowell is doing and get it done at the same time?

Mr. Witmer: The only thing that I can say is the people that I need and the resources that I need, I need them and I know when I need them. If you can tack onto something else afterwards or before that, I guess that is doable. In order for me to keep pace while my staff is being trained, work isn't going to get done unless I have some bodies to do the work.

Mr. Hartwick: That is what we hear from the PD department.

Mr. Haste: I heard that from the PD's for two years and they're not doing anything.

Mr. Hartwick: A year and eight months.

Mr. Haste: Right.

Mr. Witmer: This is a brand new system. It will be an intense stress level for everybody to learn the system. This is something that is going to require us to be able to focus on what we're doing and not worry about whether or not day-to-day operations are going on.

Mr. Saylor: Can I suggest, that we go back and look at the information in more detail and flush out some of the issues.

Mr. Haste: I'm all for us moving forward. We must move both forward. All I'm trying to do, is there a way to combine them and save some money? I know it's a terrible thing to try to save money but that is all I'm trying to do. If we can't so be it. I just wanted to look at that.

Mr. Guenther: I think there are ways we can do it. Also, if we look at it more in detail and if we have to be moving those people in the different court operations, they're gaining knowledge of the court and it isn't like we're always starting from scratch.

Mr. Haste: Another question, are we really at the point where we need to identify some county employees who are in departments now, pull them out of those departments and develop a pool of data entry folks that are reassigned based upon projects?

Mr. Hartwick: We can start by going to the hot-dog stand. I see some of the same people standing at the hot dog stand every day. They're county employees, but out of an eight hour day, they're there about five hours a day. That could be five hours that they could be put to work.

Mr. Haste: In front or in back of the building are smoke breaks.

Mr. Hartwick: That is where we start the recruitment process.

Mr. Saylor: Can we go back and take more of a look at these details and come up with some options?

Mr. Haste: If while we are doing that, that is something separate. If we are on a deadline to move Lowell forward, I'm all for doing it. Maybe this is where we start and maybe we need to get the temporary folks in here. If they are temporary, how long are they going to be here, Lowell?

Mr. Witmer: I'm guessing two to three months maybe, four at the most.

Mr. Haste: That is another way to look at them, if they are good at what they are doing and there is the next project maybe what we are doing is we are finding people to move to another project.

Mr. Witmer: I have a vacancy in my office and maybe we could move one of them into my office.

Mr. Haste: I knew you would. Do you already have the three people picked out?

Mr. Witmer: No, I have the wheels turning in the personnel office but we haven't identified anybody specific to interview yet. I do have a September 19th deadline when things are going to start happening and I have got to be ready.

Mr. Hartwick: I support your project, too. I've been involved from a different level and I've heard about it from your communications director, Steve Schell, who was with us in Treasury. I find it hard to believe and I need to make a point that we can't identify a pool of transition people in county government to be able to do general data entry work and pull together as a team when these projects exist. If no one can spare any employees, then I'm going to keep checking outside as people continue to stand outside the buildings for longer than breaks and lunches. I see the same people every single day. I think with the right direction from Chad and the Board we'll be able to identify some folks for that perhaps and not have to engage with an outside contractor to come in and have employees do the job.

Mr. Haste: Chad, could we have this listed next week for salary board action? If there is any additional paperwork could you see that Marie gets that?

Mr. Witmer: With regard to.....

Mr. Haste: Send her the email that you sent to us which gives her more detail since she is a member of the Salary Board. We'll take action in Salary Board next week for that. In the meantime, Chad and Dave follow-up and try to identify a pool. The first option is that we look at existing county employees that maybe we can relocate to a pool very similar to the Commonwealth and develop a pool of individuals that can be utilized wherever the need may be. We'll then start to move forward.

Mr. Witmer: I have no problem with that concept. My question is, may I still move forward with my proposal to try to obtain temporary help?

Mr. Haste: We'll have that on Salary Board next week for a vote.

Mr. Witmer: I don't want to lose another week of having personnel assist me with identifying people, etc.

Mr. Haste: I think all that can happen. Just wait until we take official action next week in Salary Board. Make sure Marie gets the information. Since it will be a Salary Board item, you will have a vote as well so if you would like to show for that.

Mr. Witmer: What time is that?

Mr. Haste: Every Wednesday at 10:00.

B. Dan Robinson, Community & Economic Development Director

1. Foreign Trade Zone

Mr. Robinson: I have with me this morning, Randy Campbell, President and CEO of Campbell Trade Group to answer some questions potentially on the foreign trade zone concept.

Back in August of last year, we commissioned that the Industrial Development Authority do a study with Gambit Interaction Corporation on a Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study for a general purpose foreign trade zone. The executive summary results of that report I think were shared with you back in February of this year. Within that, Dauphin County has some key ingredients for economic development which are not ordinarily found throughout the rest of the state. We have a major port of entry. It is not a harbor but it is the Susquehanna River. We do have two prime sites that could be used for foreign trade zones. We also had some potential collaboration with Cumberland, Perry, Fulton and Centre Counties as well as some others. We have Keystone Innovation Zone at the Penn State Harrisburg Campus as well as some partnerships with the World Trade Center out of south central Pennsylvania. I've given you a brief summary of four options which we'll probably be presenting to our Industrial Development Authority Board next month and also wanted to get feedback from you, the Board, today

or at a later date. We are not asking for any action but if I could briefly go over them. The four options are: #1 maintain the status quo, currently Dauphin County does have a foreign trade zone opportunity available to it. That includes marketing and consultation with businesses. The pluses of that are there is no expenditure of time and no acceptance of liability. We can partner with other areas such as Berks County, York County and even Philadelphia. The negatives of the status quo, is there is no representation on the Board. We have no naming rights for marketing. We do not call it a Dauphin County Trade Zone, per se but we do have the opportunity to partner.

Option two, again the Foreign Trade Zone would be open to us. We could be granted a seat on the Board if we would sign an agreement with an adjacent Foreign Trade Zone. We could officially call it the Dauphin County Trade Zone. There would be no expenditure of money, no acceptance of liability but we would have some naming rights in the marketing and part of our tool kit. Again there wouldn't be any expenditure to the County but staff in our office or others would have to prepare and attend board meetings on a regular monthly basis.

Option three, is the York Type Agreement. Again some of the similar opportunities are available. There is no cost however 50% of the revenue that any of the Foreign Trade Zone companies would yield in Dauphin County would be kept by the County. That is another reason to look at option #3. Conversely under option #2, we would not derive any revenue but we would derive the benefits. The negatives of that are that it would require creation of a new corporation. We do not have one in existence that would qualify today. There would be some liability which we would have to make that expenditure each year. We would spend some money in marketing. All of these are not necessarily negatives but they are costs that would be incurred.

The fourth option is to create totally and separately our own Foreign Trade Zone in Dauphin County. We would have the exclusive naming rights. We would derive 100% of revenue if any would come in. The negatives to that, there would be a substantial expenditure of the County with time and money. We are probably looking anywhere from \$50,000-\$100,000 to start this. We would need to hire a FTZ administrator and we would assume the total cost of that.

Any of these options that we would chose or not chose can be changed at any time. If for example we would chose option #2 and we saw that a multitude of companies were taking advantage of the benefits, we could separate from option #2 and go to option #4 or #3.

Mr. Haste: If we were in option #3, could we go to #4 at some future time?

Mr. Robinson: That is my understanding.

Mr. Haste: What would happen to those businesses that were established under that agreement? Would they stay in the agreement or would they move to our FTZ if we would start one?

Mr. Robinson: That's a good question and I will turn that over to Mr. Campbell. I believe they would be transferable.

Mr. Haste: You're with?

Mr. Campbell: My name is Randy Campbell. I'm with Campbell Trade Group. My company performs the administration for Foreign Trade Zone 147 that encompasses southeastern and south central Pennsylvania.

Mr. Haste: Is that York?

Mr. Campbell: FTZ 147, the grantee is based in Reading, Pennsylvania. Maybe a brief explanation of the structure of the FTZ in south central Pennsylvania would be helpful. Back in 1988, the FTZ 147 was created at the Reading Municipal Airport. It was never used. In the mid 90's, a company was looking in York County that expressed to the York County Economic Development Corporation, if you have a FTZ we will come and if you don't we're going to look elsewhere. Timeframes for creating FTZs are such that, there is no way to meet that economic opportunity but the realization was there that zone activity and zone benefits needed to be put forth to companies in the region and we looked at a way to create that. In 1996, an expansion was created to bring FTZ benefits to central Pennsylvania from the Reading area. Three more trade zone purpose sites were created at that time all were created in York County. That is where the majority of that activity had focused.

Mr. Haste: So York is a sub-zone of your zone?

Mr. Campbell: York has what is now about a 93 year agreement with Berks County FTZ to administer the FTZ on the west side of the Susquehanna River. That encompasses all of the areas on the west side of the Susquehanna River not just York. It is not a sub-zone. It is part of FTZ 147. It is simply an administrative agreement that provides for the creation of a new board of directors with cross representation of board members from the organization in York and the organization in Reading and the collection of user fees on the west side of the river by that organization with the transfer back of a portion of those user fees to the Reading organization, the Berks FTZ to cover their liability as well.

Mr. Haste: What is that split?

Mr. Campbell: It is 75% stays with the York FTZ and 25% goes back to the real grantee of the zone. On that 75%, that sounds like a tremendous number, since 1996 there had been two companies that have used the FTZ for a total of about 2 ½ years. The user fees are set at \$12,000 a year. The recovery cost has not yet come to fruition and probably never will. I wanted to make sure there was a complete understanding. FTZs are not meant to be revenue generating opportunities. They are meant to be economic development tools that are provided for by a community to encourage trade related

benefits to come to companies to encourage them to locate or remain in a community. They don't end up being revenue generating or net revenue generation. They usually end up being cost centers. That is a bit of the background of what and how the FTZ here was created.

Proposal type #3, to create that type of an agreement would be to create a new board of directors with representation that sits on the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania and representation from the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania which is the grantee of the FTZ and sitting on the board here as well to make sure that both organizations are looking at the zone project in the same manner. There would be some retention of users' fees, should those occur and my guess is the grantee would be looking at the same situation as in effect as the York zone and that is 75% kept by the local community and 25% sent back. Now out of the 75% that is where the marketing liability and all the ongoing costs of administration come from. Those are provided by the grantee.

In options #1 & #2, all those activities are provided by the grantee.

Mr. Robinson: If we go back to the Chairman's question, any companies that would locate or utilize the FTZ, "would they be transferable should a new zone be created in Dauphin County at a later date or would they be obligated to the existing agreement?"

Mr. Campbell: There is currently in the zone schedule which is the document that outlays the procedures provides for that exact circumstance that in the first year of movement of business out of FTZ 147 into a new zone, it is a declining fee schedule. I can't remember the exact number. It extends over five years where a portion of the fees remain with the grantee. In each year those fees that remain with the existing grantee reduce down and transfer over to the new grantee. So there is a provision in place for that.

Option #3, would be put together so that the agreement would be such that it would preclude option #4 from happening because of the different nature of that type of operation. It almost is its own FTZ because it accepts the liability and the retention of all those other fees.

Mr. Haste: What is the liability?

Mr. Campbell: The FTZs are kind of a unique animal in the world of trade. It is a trade facilitation program. It is not a customs program. It is meant to remedy the inequities in trade agreements and trade policy created by the United States Government. The FTZ law and the FTZ regulations from the FTZs board identify the grantee as the organization that is responsible for establishment, operation, and administration of the FTZ. It provides for a penalty of up to \$1,000 for any violation of either the FTZ Act or regulations or the customs regulations that go along with the FTZ program. Ultimately, even though most day-to-day responsibility gets transferred off to a company who is actually achieving the benefits of using a FTZ, the ultimate liability of how that company

handles and complies with the laws of the FTZ goes back to the grantee. The grantee is the only organization by law allowed to perform those activities. By normal contract law, that is put aside to the individual company but the actual grantee is responsible ultimately for the actions of that company. That is where the liability comes into place. If a company does something wrong, the grantee can potentially be fined by the FTZ board.

Mr. Haste: Can't the grantee, by way of contract, put that financial burden back on the violator?

Mr. Campbell: Yes, by contract but that does not take the grantee out of the loop. That also puts the grantee in a position where they are defending against an investigation or with an investigation from the FTZ board that can act specifically against the grantee and does not have the authority to act against the operator, because the contractor is not with the FTZ board. That's the liability. The partnership right now with York County has assumed to the greatest extent that it can under law.

Mr. Haste: If you are here as a member of the FTZ 147, I don't see that as one of the options here. Why wouldn't we set up a similar situation that York has with 147 instead of us contracting with York? I see Skip giving me the #3 sign, meaning it is the third option. If that is the case, why wouldn't we contract with 147 directly instead of through York and if we did that why wouldn't we have the 75/25 split as opposed to the 50/50 split that is mentioned here?

Mr. Campbell: You are absolutely correct. The option #3, which is named York type agreement, that option was structured similar to what the York area has.

Mr. Haste: So it wouldn't be with York it would be with 147?

Mr. Campbell: It would be directly with the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania which is the official FTZ.

Mr. Haste: Why would it be 50/50 instead of the 75/25?

Mr. Campbell: I think that was simply a misstatement. My guess is that the grantee board, the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania would approve the same type of agreement.

Mr. Robinson: You could structure that either way I guess. The current setup with York is 75/25.

Mr. Campbell: Correct.

Mr. Robinson: Again, it is the York type not partnering with York.

Mr. Haste: When we did the survey, was there any interest? When this came to us the way it was presented, there could be this great need, this great benefit, quite frankly it made a lot of sense. With some of the things that I saw going on in fact and part of what peaked my interest is that we're trying to do the international markets and things like that. I talked with a major importer on Linglestown Road and it seemed like there was some need. Is there any need?

Mr. Robinson: Our Gambit survey did interview every municipality and sent letters to every municipality, as well as over a hundred companies. If you can see in the yellow, it shows how many responded or at least gave us some feedback. The white shows no interest. From that I think in our conversations with Skip Memmi and others, we didn't have any direct feedback. Some of the ones you recommended, we did talk with them and it was not a direct link to what we are doing here but they did express an interest. I think what we found statistically is why the FTZ concept is quite useful, it is under utilized nationwide. It is not heavily used other than ports of call. However, it is a good thing to have in your toolbox when companies are looking. You will at least be on the radar screen if you have this directly in your county or region.

Mr. Haste: I think if we have it and move in that direction, we ought to take an active role in trying to relocate and get people here. I do think as we move forward, those who are able to compete in the global market will be able to do better because that is where the market is going.

Mr. Robinson: I think, too, our office sits on the eight-county regional team Pennsylvania Corporation. I think this is some partnership. York is also in that, obviously Dauphin, Cumberland, Perry, Franklin, Adams and Lebanon County. This may be a partnership where we can use it as a regional tool for all of us to use and share in the board member and share in the cost. I think our office and again, we'll take our lead from the IDA Board and yourselves, would not recommend maintaining the Status Quo. I think we are looking somewhere in the middle of that. But I think we do need direct representation as some of these other options include. I think we want to call it, "The Dauphin County Foreign Trade Zone". We can accomplish that in two, three or four. But maintaining the Status Quo, I think is not where we should be.

Mr. Hartwick: You said under the York Agreement expenditure of county time and money, what is the money?

Mr. Campbell: In order for a company to understand that the program number one exists, and number two, what the benefits might be to them.

Mr. Hartwick: Marketing dollars.

Mr. Campbell: It is marketing dollars but not just marketing dollars it is a matter of getting information out to them. But it is also a matter of providing someone to talk with them, to do the analysis for them so that they know what the benefits are. It is not a program that is familiar to a lot of companies. If in fact it were, there would be FTZs all

around the region or all around the area. That is not simply the case. The ongoing administration of the program through education of a person to understand a zone's program to be able to talk to companies about that as well as the maintenance of a board of directors and the associated costs with that are the dollar expenditures.

Mr. Haste: Is that what you do and is that your role in York?

Mr. Campbell: In all of FTZ 147, I do that now in Dauphin County.

Mr. Haste: Even though you are based in York, you work for Reading entity?

Mr. Campbell: Yes, I have a Marketing Administration Agreement with both organizations, both the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania and the Partnership for Economic Development.

Mr. Haste: If we were to move in that direction and get a York type of agreement, would you be that person that we would be paying to do that on our behalf or would we be looking at having Skip or Dan or someone like that do it?

Mr. Campbell: That would be a matter to be determined in the future, however you would want to structure that.

Mr. Hartwick: But with your expertise, what type of agreement do you have with York if it is a similar situation?

Mr. Campbell: I do everything for the Zone. I do the day-to-day administration. I do the marketing. I do the analysis. I prepare for the Board meetings. I do the communication with the FTZ Board. I conduct seminars around the area. The function of that was that once I left the York County Economic Development Corporation, I went to Washington as the Executive Director of the National Association of Foreign Trade Zone. Through that organization, I was involved in instructing customs at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center on how to administer FTZs. I was involved in writing the FTZ manual to allow both companies and customs on how to administer the FTZ. I participate as a co-chairman in the World Free Zone Association and have spoke on FTZs in three different continents. I participated as the Department of Treasury in the Black Market Pasco's Exchange Program. The realization of, there was someone local to be able to handle all of those marketing administrative activities and problems, is how I came to be the Administrator of the FTZ 147.

Mr. Hartwick: I obviously recognize your expertise in the area and that is well respected. I don't mean to be blunt, but sometimes I usually am. How much are you paid by York?

Mr. Campbell: My agreement with both of the organizations is, I receive 50% of the user fees that are collected. If there are no user fees collected, I don't get paid.

Mr. Hartwick: That is a good incentive for you to try to get companies.

Mr. Campbell: Yes, it is a good incentive to get companies to use the FTZ.

Mr. Haste: How many companies have you gotten to relocate to the region?

Mr. Campbell: Relocation is not something you need to be looking at for FTZs because it usually doesn't happen.

Mr. Haste: It is helping those who are there now.

Mr. Campbell: My take on the program is helping existing companies is where the most benefit occurs. There are 270+ some odd general purpose zones around the country. Any company who is looking can find a FTZ if they need one. It is the other economic development activities that cause them to locate. Lack of a zone activity may keep them from coming but having one will not necessarily make them come. Right now Smith Kline Beechman in Hanover, Pennsylvania, is the only active FTZ site in the region. Clark Shoes Distribution just across the York County line in Adams County is a sub-zone that is just about ready to activate. Those are the active users of FTZ 147. There has only ever been one other and that was Baker Refectories. Their problem has since been solved so they are no longer part of it.

Mr. Hartwick: Hershey Foods, I understand that they import and I just want to hear your explanation of this. I've heard from some other folks. They obviously import cocoa beans. They do a lot of sugar. Why wouldn't they be a prime target for wanting to be involved with the FTZ?

Mr. Campbell: That is the first company that a lot of people think of when you think about a FTZ. The answer to the question is very complex however. FTZ program is a trade policy program. Use of a FTZ cannot circumvent US Trade Policy. The US Trade Policy is such that there are price controls and quantitative controls on the importation of foreign sugar quotas. US FTZ cannot be used to circumvent that established US Trade Policy and allow the use of foreign sugar for domestic consumption. The reasons for that are very complex. In fact, Hershey Foods had submitted a FTZ application many, many years ago. I believe it was in the 60's. Brach Candies out of Chicago submitted a FTZ application and Hershey Foods submitted one on their heels. Brach's application was denied because of the sugar quotas and Hershey withdrew their FTZ application. I don't see them moving forward. For sugar may be some of their other activities have changed that there is a benefit but their greatest benefit would have been the importation and use of sugar. That is not a benefit that can accrue to them.

Mr. Saylor: I have a press report that there has been a development in Franklin County. It is from the end of July. Franklin County either joined or started a FTZ. Did they go through consideration similar to what we are having here?

Mr. Campbell: How all of this started back last June, a number of private developers approached FTZ 147 seeking to have sites included in the FTZ. The FTZ of Southeastern Pennsylvania and the Partnership of Economic Development of York proposed option #2 to all counties where the private industry had a desire to create a general purpose site. That included Franklin County, Cumberland County, Dauphin County, Lancaster County and there is a proposed site in Lehigh County as well. This same proposal was put forth to all of them. Franklin County and Lancaster County have opted to participate, at least unofficially, as option #2. Cumberland County has not yet made a determination. The sites around in the current pending FTZ expansion for 147 include two sites in Franklin County; WCN properties which is around a target distribution center and Letterkenny; Prologess Industrial Park in Shippensburg; there is the Logistic Center just off the turnpike in Carlisle. You can see it from the turnpike. Those are the two in Cumberland County. In Dauphin County it is the Capital Business Center of the old Fruehauf Plant behind Penn State Harrisburg. In Lancaster County it is the Conewago Industrial Park and then in Lehigh it is the Logistic Center. Those are the sites in the current pending expansion application. Again Franklin and Lancaster have, unofficially, opted to participate in option #2. Franklin's participation will be on the Partnership for Economic Development of York County Board which is currently under the process of changing their by-laws to allow that to happen. Lancaster would be under the FTZ of Southeastern Pennsylvania which also is changing their by-laws to allow that to happen. That is the same as where Dauphin County would fit into on the Board of the official grantee not on the Board once removed.

Mr. Robinson: Back to the Commissioners' question on expenditure of the County under option #3, if no benefit is derived there may not be a lot of expenditure based on your current contract with York, is that correct?

Mr. Campbell: That is true. There would be no payments back to me or my company but there would be cost of creating marketing materials and getting that marketing material out, there would be the cost of maintaining a board of directors. If there is no revenue coming, there is no payment. If there are no user fees coming in there are no user fees going out either.

Mr. Haste: Is there a collective recommendation from you and Skip?

Mr. Robinson: I think our initial feeling in weighing all the options and weighing the lack of activity around the nation except at the specific ports of call would probably be for the IDA Board and this Board to consider option #2 or #3. I'm not sure that we have the comfort level with option #4 or the staffing necessarily to accomplish all that the current 147 does on our own right now.

Mr. Haste: If we are going that way, why wouldn't we do option #3?

Mr. Robinson: Really after today's discussion, I don't see why we wouldn't do option #3. To be honest with you, I was leaning towards option #2 as a short term baby step but option #3, I don't see any negatives under what was discussed today.

Mr. Haste: I thought I understood this. I sat through a couple different presentations on FTZ. Mr. Davi has told me a lot and I've learned that he is optimistic. I've scaled back a lot of what I've heard from him. There are companies and I don't understand why they are not participating when to me it sounds like it would be a benefit to them. If it is, how do we get them and what would we do to get them on board? If we take this step, I really want to see companies take advantage of this. I would love to see a company, like Harman Stove and KBI, any of those that are out there, I think anybody importing and exporting is somebody to look at. Some don't have the tariff restrictions. If I understand this right, the more restrictions the more attractive this may be to them. Is that correct?

Mr. Campbell: The higher the tariffs on their products, the more attractive the program is.

Mr. Haste: I guess as Congress imposes more and more tariffs and makes things more difficult, it makes this a little more attractive in some industries. Is that correct?

Mr. Campbell: In actuality as to what is happening is, tariffs across the board are being reduced. Tariffs are lower today than they were five years ago.

Mr. Haste: Does that make this less attractive?

Mr. Campbell: That does make this less attractive. The better shape that the economy is in, the less attractive the program is. All the new trade agreements that are being entered into by the United States make the FTZ program less attractive for most companies. Somewhere in that trade agreement there is going to be a problem that is created for a particular industry segment. Those companies then may find additional benefit into the program. To answer your earlier question, companies hesitate to use the program basically for three reasons. The benefits are fine but there is also a cost involved. There is a cost in creating a zone for that company. There is an ongoing cost of administration. And if there is any level of volume of movement of merchandise, there simple inventory system can cost up to \$100,000. So they are looking at potentially a quarter of a million dollars of expenditures upfront and then they are going to wait a year, or year and half before they can even start to realize any of the return on that investment once the FTZ Board approves their program. That is number one. Number two, there is added customs involvement, added government involvement. The customs service has the ability to review merchandise while it is in the possession of the company until it leaves the company rather than when it hits the port.

Mr. Haste: Because that zone basically becomes title property.

Mr. Campbell: It is considered outside of the customs territory for customs purposes.

Mr. Robinson: But it is monitored by the US Customs Office. I think the same goes true even for our IDA financing as rates have been lower our activity is less versus in the early 80's when IDA was the first choice for bank financing.

Mr. Haste: But if I understand this, too, again if this is a tool in our toolbox as you say, and the economy takes a turn the other way, or a new administration comes in and decides to start tightening our trade agreements as opposed to easing our trade agreements, this may be something that we may need to keep a company in operation.

Mr. Robinson: Right and I think that is a good thing about Dauphin County and our region. We lead the area in retention of companies and we need to continue to find ways to keep them here.

Mr. Haste: If that is the case, when the economy took the turn in the past, did we lose any companies that we could have kept or did it really not matter? Is there a company that left this area?

Mr. Robinson: The major company that left this area in the last ten years has been AMP. That fortunately was not a result of the economy. However, that has been our bonus for the last 3-4 years. We have those ready made buildings. We have the insulated economy but we also have the manufacturing that's still out there that this can be a tool in our toolbox for a company like Harman Stove which has expressed an interest or if things change Hershey Foods or our other food manufacturing plants could be viable. If no activity occurs, we still have it and we're still a part of it and there is not a lot of cost at this point.

Mr. Haste: I would support moving forward with the third option.

Mr. Hartwick: I would, too.

Mr. Saylor: Two points, one is the issue of marketing. You may recall at our Economic Summit one of the issues that came out of that was the idea that we need to market county programs. Take a look at the way we do that or ways to improve that. Certainly if we add the FTZ to the tool chest that as a whole can be made a part of that as we set up a task force to take a look at that. The other thing is perhaps if the IDA Board is going to look at this perhaps we should wait to see if the IDA makes a recommendation or do we want to make a recommendation to the IDA?

Mr. Haste: I've already been before the IDA and I totally support moving forward with some type of arrangement. Granted when I first heard this, I was a lot more optimistic than I am now. The way it is presented it sounds like this would be a way for us to attract a lot of interesting businesses here which doesn't pan out to be that way. Maybe it is just a sign of the times.

Mr. Robinson: I think the good news is we're not locked in really on any of these proposals. If times change or conditions change, we can always go to four, we can always maintain. If it is the vote of the Board, I can take this recommendation back.

Mr. Haste: I thought I understood Mr. Campbell to say if we took option #3, that really minimizes our ability to go to option #4. Is that correct?

Mr. Campbell: I think that is the assurance that the FTZ Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania would be looking for.

Mr. Haste: If what you have to lose is just 25%, to me that seems to be a reasonable amount. When it was 50/50, I wasn't real sure. If what you really have to lose is 25% of the potential revenue and revenues really not where you drive a lot of your income....it really sounds like it is more...it was presented to me as to develop another revenue stream. If that is not the case, really what it is about is increasing your tax base and saving your tax base.

Mr. Hartwick: You said something about the sign of the times, you said through FTZ 147 there have only been three companies that have benefited. How long has it been in existence, since 1988?

Mr. Campbell: The original zone was created in 1988. There has never been a user in the Reading area. The only users have been so far in York County.

Mr. Robinson: At one point in Dauphin County, the Olivetti Building I guess which did typewriter manufacturing had used the FTZ years ago or set one up.

Mr. Campbell: That's true, Olivetti Typewriter was a sub-zone off of the Wilkes-Barre FTZ years ago. When that industry moved to Mexico the use of the facility here ended and therefore the FTZ ended. That was the first use of the FTZ in central Pennsylvania.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Throughout your calling all businesses Dan, how much have you brought this up as a topic and how much interest have you seen based on the businesses that you reached out to and called upon?

Mr. Robinson: As a result of the Gambit Survey, some of those companies that we got feedback on, we did revisit to the business calling program and did discuss that again and one in particular was Harman Stoves as a possibility as they expand. In general, because of the make-up of our county and it is semi-light on manufacturing, we've not seen a tremendous amount of interest even though we do bring it up as an option. And I believe it is one of the questions on that 200 question survey is, "do you import and export items?" Whenever there is a yes to that, that is where we bring that up.

Mr. Haste: Talk with the IDA.

Mr. Robinson: Our next IDA Board meeting is in September and maybe we'll bring that recommendation back to the county and keep you posted.

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: The first item in the personnel packet is the salary board request. Spring Creek's beautician is retiring and is coming back part-time. So we are reclassifying a position. With fewer residents, they don't need a full-time beautician. She is willing to work part-time.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Is there a policy reason why she was doing a volunteer segment between the time that she becomes part-time? Is there a reason why she has to do that?

Ms. Sinner: Yes, she has to wait until she receives her first pension check and then as a part-time employee, she will have to keep her hours under 1,000 hours per year because of being retired.

There are reclassifications of positions in Children & Youth, Prison and Schaffner. Are there any questions on any of the salary board items? (There were none.)

Mr. Haste: So next week, you will also have in the packet Lowell's? Is that how we are going to do that?

Ms. Sinner: I don't have a salary board request for it. I can put the email in.

Mr. Haste: Yes, I think we need to. List it on here. You have enough information. When you do this little chart, add it on so we don't lose it in the process.

Ms. Sinner: All right, I'll be happy to do that. In the vacancy list, there are some for Children & Youth; a clerk typist in MH/MR; positions at the Prison; and some Youth Program Specialist I's at Schaffner. There is a full-time position that we are requesting to fill and four part-time, Youth Program Specialists. I'm going to request a vote today because there are three part-timers being hired with the start date of August 22. That will be before next week's meeting. I'll request permission for those hires.

Mr. Haste: Which ones are those?

Ms. Sinner: Highlighted, 28, 29 & 30. Then there is a transfer.....

Mr. Haste: It looks like you are asking for a vote on 32 & 33 as well?

Mr. DiFrancesco: And 38.

Ms. Sinner: Yes, and 38 is the transfer to a full-time Program Specialist. 32 & 33 are Spring Creek transfers, CNA's changing from full-time to per diem and vice versa.

Those transfers are effective the 15th as well as the transfer to Schaffner. Do you have any questions on any of the other transactions in the packet?

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to approve items #28, 29, 30, 32, 33 & 38?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve Items #28, 29, 30, 32, 33 & 38 in the Personnel Packet; motion carries.

Ms. Sinner: Did you say #8 & 9? I didn't catch that. The vacancies.

Mr. Haste: No, can we amend that to include items #8 & 9?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Sure.

Mr. Haste: Are there any other questions? (There were none.)

Ms. Sinner: I have overtime reports and overtime requests for Tax Assessment and the Prison. We have an addendum that has a request to fill three part-time security officer vacancies. There are two new hires for the Prison. That is everything.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: You all should have received your purchase order packet yesterday. As usual there are a number of budget issues that we need to resolve. We'll work on that between now and next week. The items are there for your review. If you have any questions, let me know and we'll get them fixed up for next week for a vote.

In addition, Chad asked me to bring up the recommendation from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic on the District Justice Office.

Mr. Haste: Before you go to that, there are some questions on the packet.

Mr. Hartwick: I have a few questions but none is as important as page 17 & 38. Actually, they are the two ones. I see there are quite a few office chairs being purchased by EMA. The ones on page 38 are "five office chairs for \$3,425 which equals \$685 a chair?"

Mr. Baratucci: You got it. Those are the chairs that EMA over the years have requested to purchase for their people.....let me get this straight. The chairs are used 24 hours a day. There are three shifts and there is somebody in that chair all the time. They informed me that they needed an extra duty special quality chair because if not because of the way that they are used, they will not hold up. So over the years, we've purchased for lack of a better word, "better quality chairs" for those situations out there.

Mr. Hartwick: At first, I thought they were Judge's chairs. Now I hear they massage your neck, back and shoulders for \$685. We are buying these on state costs?

Mr. Baratucci: Yes. I believe there are much more expensive chairs located throughout the County for different purposes. You can purchase chairs anywhere from \$99 to well over a \$1,000. It really does depend on the quality of the chair. It depends on the individual that is using the chair. If you look at page #17 and look at page #38, there is a difference.

Mr. Hartwick: They purchase fourteen chairs for \$5,226 which is a significant amount of money for chairs. I don't know why we need fourteen chairs. Are they using different offices for different purposes, why the big variety of different prices of chairs? Are some going to the management? The issue that I have is, we should be trying to figure out what is the best cost for chairs and \$685 a chair....that is a significant amount.

Mr. Baratucci: That is the explanation that was given to me way back when we made the first purchase of these type of chairs and it has been going on for a couple of years now. I don't have any other explanation other than what EMA gave me and it sort of made some sense in that most of us are not sitting in the chair for 24 hours a day.

Mr. Hartwick: Page 38, \$3,425, those are the five expensive chairs.

Mr. Baratucci: It is just shy of \$700 per chair.

Mr. Haste: Are these the chairs that actually go to the pods?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Yes.

Mr. Haste: They do get used hard.

Mr. Baratucci: Like I said, somebody is in them all the time because there are three shifts. That is the way they explained it. Somebody is actually sitting in it all the time.

Mr. Haste: How many pods are there?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Four pods. Two or three work stations per pod.

Mr. Hartwick: I could see justifying that expense for chairs if the life of these chairs is longer than over lives of chairs. If it is strictly just for comfort.....

Mr. Baratucci: That is exactly what I'm referring to. The fact that the chairs are sat in for 24 hours a day, every day.....

Mr. Hartwick: How long do these chairs go before they need replaced? I mean, these are five new ones. How long has it been since they have been replaced?

Mr. Baratucci: I don't know off hand. They buy a couple over time as they do wear out. According to EMA, they do last much longer than the average chair.

Mr. Hartwick: What do we do with the old \$685 chairs?

Mr. Baratucci: I would imagine they will go into our surplus out at the warehouse.

Mr. Hartwick: I got to check these things out.

Mr. Baratucci: I'm not trying to pass the buck but you should probably talk directly to Robb or somebody out there who can give a little more detail. Basically, that is the way it was explained to me when we made the very first purchase of these chairs. I am an advocate, we usually purchase chairs in the vicinity of \$200 and when I saw the price originally, I asked the same question and that is what I was told. They are used 24 hours a day, every day.

Mr. Haste: There probably are not other chairs in the County that get used like those do.

Mr. Baratucci: Exactly, because somebody has to be in that chair every minute every day.

Mr. Haste: If you watch one of those pods in operation, they don't sit still. They get a call they are zooming here and there.

Mr. Baratucci: I think it is quality. It made some semblance of sense.

Mr. Hartwick: I certainly would like to see the surplus chair. Are they for sale?

Mr. Baratucci: They will probably try to use them elsewhere. That is the first thing we try to use if they are still usable perhaps in a less intense area. That would be our first preference.

Mr. Hartwick: What determines if they are usable?

Mr. Baratucci: If you go about the County, you can see a lot of places where you might look at it and say it is still usable and somebody else would indicate they need a new chair. There are probably a lot of places. We reuse a lot of stuff.

Mr. Haste: If it gets to the final surplus, I've gone out and looked at that stuff and it is bad.

Mr. Hartwick: That's what they put in my office.

Mr. Baratucci: That is what I was going to say, if you look at our surplus list that comes out, there aren't too many things on there that aren't heavily beat.

Mr. Saylor: Should I have Mr. Wentzel call the Commissioner to further explain this?

Mr. DiFrancesco: My recommendation, before the conversation started, was that I wanted to make sure that you were involved in looking at what they are buying to see if that same quality of chair could be bought some place else at a lower price. If you come back and you're satisfied then I'm satisfied.

Mr. Baratucci: We actually did that research and they have been buying the same chair now for a couple of years and that was a result of that research. We've had numerous chairs brought in and actually looked at and sat in, etc.

Mr. Hartwick: You can't blame me for raising the question.

Mr. Baratucci: That was a valid question. That was the explanation that I was given and it seems to make some sense.

Mr. Hartwick: Number two, what are unallocable telephone costs?

Mr. Baratucci: What page?

Mr. Hartwick: Page 6.

Mr. Baratucci: Since I'm responsible for the phone system and rather than try to figure out and we buy something that would benefit the entire phone, there is a separate budget. If you look at the 1773001, that is an off shout of 177300 which is I.T.'s main budget. Any phone accessories that help support the system gets run through here. That is just what they call it. It is unallocable to the departments.

Mr. Hartwick: The sound system for court room #3. Carolyn, do you want to take this one?

Mr. Haste: Who is the judge in that court room?

Mr. Baratucci: After I pulled this report, I got a call from the Court Administration Office and said to change it to court room #4. So we will be changing it to court room #4.

Ms. Thompson: That is correct. As part of a study a few years ago, we had people coming in because the sound systems are constantly breaking down and we're spending a significant amount of money on repairs every year. We had a couple companies come in and take a look and make recommendations as to the status of all the sound systems and try to rate them in order as to how good they are, how bad they are. It came back five possibly six out of the eight needed to be completely replaced at some point in time. We've been patching them together. We have in our next year's budget to replace one. We're trying to keep up with the sound systems and may be the carpets doing one court room a year and a chamber a year. Of course because of the

budget issues, each year the money has been stripped out. We wait until this time of the year and if we have the funds available, we are trying to do one or two court rooms a year. We're going to do one court room a year. We committed to do Judge Bratton's court room and chambers with carpets this year. Judge Kleinfelter is having some significant issues with his. He is also experiencing some hearing issues on his own. Right now we're going to do Judge Kleinfelter's. This is part of a three to four year study that we've been doing.

Mr. Hartwick: Did we ever replace the carpet in Ed Marsico's Office?

Mr. Baratucci: We're working on it right now.

Mr. Hartwick: That is terrible.

Mr. Haste: It is getting done.

Mr. Hartwick: So we changed that from #3 to #4?

Mr. Baratucci: Yes, it was changed to #4. In the report next week, it will be changed to #4.

Mr. Hartwick: Police costs for closing Front Street for Fort Hunter. That's something that is budgeted and happens every year? Anything we do in the County we do provide local reimbursements to law enforcements if they have to be used or is this special for Fort Hunter?

Mr. Baratucci: Basically every year for Fort Hunter Day. We've done this since I've been here. Susquehanna comes out and provides that support and we pay them for it.

Mr. Haste: We pay for traffic control.

Mr. Hartwick: The consulting services for Dauphin County HAZ Mat, that seems to be a budget issue.

Mr. Baratucci: According to them, they have the money. They just have to move it into that particular code. I already contacted everybody that's on here that is over budget and they all assured me that they would move the money into that right code.

Mr. Hartwick: Do you know what they are doing there?

Mr. Baratucci: I do not know any more details on that.

Mr. Haste: That is part of HATS. With HATS there is an overall regional goods and movement study being done and they contacted EMA because of hazardous materials movements. That's actually a HATS program.

Mr. Hartwick: We're getting HATS money to fund it?

Mr. Haste: I think there is.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The warranty for the chairs is three to five years.

Mr. Baratucci: In addition, I mentioned and gave you a copy of a recommendation from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic on the bids that we received for the new district justice office. Chad said to present it today. We don't need to vote on it until next week. You can review them. It's all the low bids. I believe it is a little more than what was budgeted but I understand that's being worked out. That will be there for your review and vote next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Are you sure we don't want to accept this before gas prices go up to \$3.00/gallon?

Mr. Baratucci: We have the bids locked in long enough to wait until next week.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: We have the training packet. There are no items that we need to deal with today.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Haste: We have items for discussion and A, B, & C are being requested to vote on today. Is there a motion to approve Items A, B, & C?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to approve the following items A, B, & C; motion carries.

- A. Agreement between Dauphin County and ExacuTrack Service to demonstrate some equipment with a Juvenile Probation Agency employee.
(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 8/17/05)**
- B. Agreement for Solicitor Services for Paternity and Support Matters for Courts/Domestic Relations.
(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 8/17/05)**
- C. Approval of an Intergovernmental Cooperation Grant/Crime Network (CNET) between Dauphin County Community & Economic Development Office and the Boroughs of Penbrook and Paxtang.
(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 8/17/05)**
- D. Reappoint Teresa Smith to the Dauphin County Social Services**

for Children & Youth Advisory Board. (Term expires August, 2008)

- E. Appoint Jim Willshier to the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) filling the vacancy of Barbara Groce with Harrisburg Regional Chamber.
- F. Appoint Antonio Robert Pena to the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) filling the vacancy of Kirsten Page with WHP CBS 21.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tully: Nothing to add to the report and happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Haste: Nick, has indicated that we need to take action on a HAZ Mat funding issue, Global Insight.

Mr. Hartwick: So we need to take action on page 31 of the purchase order packet.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Solicitors are you aware?

Mr. Tully: I haven't seen the purchase order.

Mr. Haste: On page 31 of the purchase order packet, do you have any indication that we need to take action on that this week?

Mr. Baratucci: No, they didn't mention anything about it.

Mr. Tully: As indicated on the correspondence they asked for review on the 17th and voted on the next legislative cycle.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Okay.

Mr. Baratucci: They had a blank copy attached to the item but I figured it was going through the regular Solicitor's Office procedure.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: One brief item that I would like to bring to your attention, and will be slated for a vote with everything next week, that is the auditing services for the district justice offices. As you will recall the audit committee has been systematically reviewing all the auditing needs of the county and we put the auditing requirement for the district justice offices out for bid. We have a bid recommendation that we continue to use ZA to do that auditing for us. This year we're paying in the neighborhood of \$34,000-35,000. As a result of the bid process it will be around \$28,000 and change for the next three years. It is to the credit of the hard work of the Controller's Office. They helped put the bid together and got the process moving forward. It will be for your consideration next week.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Hartwick: I want to invite whoever is here and the Board to a public meeting that is happening at 7:00 p.m. tonight at the Upper Dauphin High School auditorium regarding the Upper Dauphin location and subcommittee of the Upper Dauphin Human Services Advisory Panel. They will be taking public input about the proposed sites for the new Upper Dauphin Government Center.

Mr. Haste: A reminder of Prison Board Meeting this afternoon.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Haste: We are again at the point in time for public participation. Is there anyone who has anything to ask the Board? (There was none.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to adjourn?

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

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk
August 17, 2005

printed 1/17/06