



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONERS' WORKSHOP MEETING

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2006

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; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Assistant Solicitor; Marie Rebeck, Controller; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Tom Guenther, Information Technology Director; Leila McAdoo, Solicitor's Office; Dave Schreiber, Personnel Office; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Scott Burford, Spring Creek Administrator; Skip Memmi, Economic Development; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Edgar Cohen, Facility Maintenance Director; Sharon Chatman, Human Services; Robert Hawley, Deputy Court Administrator; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; and Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Pete Carlucci, Esq., Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott; Mel Schiavelli, Harrisburg University President; Eric Darr; Paul Clancy, A. G. Edwards; Diane Tokarsky, McNeese Wallace; Dan Leppo, City of Harrisburg; Garry Lenton, Patriot News

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 Meeting minutes that we'll take up at next week's meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Mr. Haste: Pete will you please come forward?

- A. Pete Carlucci, Esq., Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott; Mel Schiavelli, University President; Eric Darr, University Chief Financial Officer; Paul Clancy, A. G. Edwards; Diane Tokarsky, McNees Representative; Donna Kreiser, Pepper Hamilton
 1. Adopt Ordinance No. 4-2006 authorizing a limited guaranty in support of proposed Bond Issue for benefit of The Harrisburg University of Science and Technology. **(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 10/18/06)**

Mr. Carlucci: I'm here today to review with you the proposed Guaranty and to make a presentation as you consider an enactment of a debt ordinance which would provide a limited guaranty for bonds to be issued by the Harrisburg Authority for the benefit of the Harrisburg University of Science and Technology. Here today are folks from the University, Dr. Schiavelli and Dr. Eric Darr, with their counsel Diane Tokarsky from McNees Wallace and Nurick. Also, attending is Paul Clancy from A.G. Edwards who will be the underwriter for the bonds.

I would like to give you an overview of the terms of the deal. These folks are available to respond to any questions that you may have and it would be appropriate if you are so inclined to move forward and take action on the debt ordinance.

The bonds that are proposed to be issued by the Harrisburg Authority are going to be in two series. Series A Bonds and Series B Bonds and although the debt ordinance

recites a maximum principal amount of the Series A Bonds to be issued to be at \$70 million the present sizing of the Series B Bonds appears to anticipate an issue of between \$59-60 million. The Series B Bonds are expected to have a term of thirty years with maturities beginning in 2011 and going out as far as 2037. Both Series A and Series B Bonds are going to be secured by a pledge of the University of its unrestricted revenues together with a mortgage on the facility that will be constructed with the proceeds of the Bonds.

The support of the Series B Bonds will be provided by a Letter of Credit and this County's Limited Guaranty. Essential terms of the guaranty are as follows: 1. The Guaranty period is a period of 10 years beginning with the fiscal year 2010 through fiscal year 2019. It anticipates that there is a maximum and annual obligation by the County in any fiscal year during this Guaranty Period of \$1,500,000. The annual amount cannot be accelerated. Beginning in year one if there is no draw under the Guaranty then the overall obligation of the County would be reduced from \$15 million to \$13,500,000 and so on as each year that ten year period progresses.

At the time the Bonds are issued, there will be a Letter of Credit estimated to be in the amount of \$3,300,000 and it will be issued by Commerce Bank and it too will provide credit support for the Series B Bonds. So long as the Letter of Credit remains in place and there is an amount available to be drawn upon under the letter, it will be drawn upon prior to any request to the County for payment under its Guaranty. The Letter of Credit terms provide that any draws under the Letter of Credit will be repaid at a minimum in 12 monthly installments beginning in the month following any draw on the Letter of Credit.

At the requests to the County for payment under its Guaranty will be made not less than 60 days prior to the date the debt service is due on the Bonds. A substitution of the original Letter of Credit will be permitted with either a replacement Letter of Credit or a deposit of cash. The University has offered to provide such budget and financial reports as the County finds necessary and appropriate.

The County's guaranty on its terms is terminable upon the University's voluntary or involuntary bankruptcy and insolvency or reorganization or foreclosure on the mortgage or the University's failure to maintain its Certificate of Authority to operate as they should by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

There will be certain financial covenants that will be contained in the financial documents and they should include a rate covenant and by way of example probably certain ratio such as expendable funds to outstanding long term debt. The Closing of the Bonds is anticipated to occur in November which is the time that the Guaranty of the County will be signed and delivered in support of the Bonds.

The Debt Ordinance that you have before you authorizes the execution and delivery of this Limited Guaranty for this ten year period with a maximum exposure of \$1,500,000 each year during that 10 year period not to exceed \$15 million in the aggregate. There

is a draft of the Limited Guaranty Agreement that appendent to the Debt Ordinance and I believe that it appears substantially in the form of which it will be finalized and required to be executed and delivered by the County at the time the bonds close. The support, of ,or this particular Guaranty is a pledge by the County of its full faith credit and taxing power.

I think that is a fair summary and overview of the transaction and the credit support that has been requested from the County.

Mr. Haste: So the Letter of Credit takes precedent over the County's draw?

Mr. Carlucci: That is correct. The Letter of Credit will be drawn upon first. As I said, however, it's required to be repaid in a minimum of 12 month installments. So it is conceivable that the full amount of the Letter of Credit will not be available at the time of the second debt service payment in any fiscal year which will trigger requirement to draw on the County's Guaranty.

Mr. Haste: How long is the obligation for the Letter of Credit?

Mr. Carlucci: The Letter of Credit is in place initially for a period of five years. It will expire in 2011. There is a one year overlap between the County's Guaranty and the current term of the Letter of Credit. However, there is an obligation on the part of the University to move forward to replace or provide a substitute Letter of Credit or have that Letter of Credit extended.

Mr. Haste: That's included in the Agreement?

Mr. Carlucci: That will be included in the Agreement.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I keep saying things over and over again when we have this conversation but I want it to be part of public record and I want it to be clearly understood by everybody that in fact this Board thinks this is a great project. We want to fully support and the means by which we are supporting is in fact by giving that backing that gives security to the markets to let them know that level of security is there and in place protecting their investments. By no means, am I voting in favor of contributing money to the University and the expectation would be that obviously the University would do everything in their power to not draw on this money. It is a safety net. We fully understand from our point of view what we are doing in terms of putting that safety net up and in fact it may be called on and we may be asked to put that money in and that's okay. I just want it to be very clear to say again that this plan is not designed for the County to be subsidizing education. This is actually designed to assist the University in moving forward with their finances so they can sell the Bonds, raise the money and build the project. Taking nothing away from it, as a matter of fact, praising it, it is a great project from an economic development perspective. It is going to be a great building. It is going to be a great addition to downtown and adding in the educational interest that will be taking place in the building. This is a fantastic project

for us to be a partner on. I feel with my responsibility to the taxpayers of Dauphin County to be on record saying again this is not designed to be a \$1.5 million contribution to the University. This is a safety net to be put in place so that we can sell the Bonds, get a good rate and get the project moving. I want to thank all of you for your hard work. This is going to be a great addition to downtown Harrisburg. It is going to be a great option for local students and students from across the country that want to come and focus their education in a good quality environment.

Mr. Hartwick: I would like to echo Commissioner DiFrancesco's comments in saying that this is not a subsidy. This is clearly trying to provide some financial backing to be able to go out and get a better rate on your Bonds and to ultimately see the project move forward. We knew that we needed to be in this position. I'm full heartedly for this project but I'm going to go one step further I don't want to be called on for the money. I think clearly setting that precedence is the wrong direction to go. We have higher expectations and your ability to meet the enrollment figures that you put forth in your report. We've seen high performance over the years and some have worked out favorably and some have not worked out favorably. We are going to be very involved in trying to make sure that we're honoring this and want you to meet your expectations. There are obviously some great benefits. I'm personally giving money toward the University. I believe it is very much one of the historic things that has occurred in this region in a number of years. The economic impact of this is going to be difficult to measure but certainly will be major. That economic impact and educational resources that you are going to provide I think are worth while. I will say I do not want to be called on for the dollars. I sincerely do not want to be in the business of funding higher education. The State has done a great job. The federal government has been pushing down responsibilities to the County from hiring and funding now to Human Service funding and now educational funding. We want to make it clear that the County is not in the business of providing money for education and it is clearly a state responsibility. With the project, we also see the economic development benefit to a project in the amount of hopefully new growth, new development, and retain young and active intelligent individuals to be able to have additional growth and expansion in the region as a result of education. We expect that you would meet all of your projections and if not we would be in a position to be pushed in the other direction.

Mr. Haste: I think the message is very clear during these negotiations. It is a great project for not just Harrisburg but for central Pennsylvania. Harrisburg just happens to be lucky enough to be the anchor of it. It will be a great regional asset for us. I totally agree with everything that Nick and George said with one exception; sorry George, but I don't think the State is doing a very good job funding education. I think that is why we've been called upon. I do think that the University understands where we are and as I don't want anyone to think our support is any less than what it is. We are full heartedly behind this. We also need to weigh the concerns of the taxpayers and the precedent that we are setting. I think you fully understand that we have confidence in your ability to follow through with that. I think this will be a great working relationship from this point forward.

Mr. Saylor: Commissioners may I make one point in case it hasn't been covered? Mr. Carlucci and I had been discussing the fact that this financing model is based on certain assumptions in terms of revenues, etc. It might be helpful to be able to go forward here and that on a regular basis have the University officials come in to the Board and review those projects, if they are being met or not. If you have an interest in doing that we'll certainly work to arrange that.

Mr. Haste: It is my understanding that some of that is spelled out in the agreement. In fact, we had a discussion yesterday on making sure that for our benefit that the University come before us during our budget cycle, the October-November area, so that we know exactly where the University stands and that we know what expectations there may be of us for our upcoming year.

Mr. Carlucci: That will be part of the documentation.

Mr. Hartwick: That will set specific dates with review periods?

Mr. Carlucci: It will. What we discussed was the possibility of having them come in during your budget process and that can vary any where from September-October.

Mr. Hartwick: We also had somebody else sit in front of us who said they would provide periodic updates to the Board recently, so excuse me for being cynical. I prefer some dates and some clearly spelled out language that makes it a requirement.

Mr. Carlucci: That would be fine.

Mr. Haste: Is there a motion to adopt Ordinance No. 4-2006?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to adopt Ordinance No. 4-2006 authorizing a limited guaranty in support of proposed Bond Issue for benefit of The Harrisburg University of Science and Technology; motion carried. (A complete copy of the Ordinance is on file in the Commissioners' Office.)

Mr. Haste: Dan, please come forward.

B. Dan Leppo from City of Harrisburg and members from McCormick Taylor

1. Update on the Walnut St. Corridor

Mr. Leppo: As you are aware during the last couple of years there has been a joint effort by four municipalities from east to west, Lower Paxton Township, Susquehanna Township, Penbrook Borough and the City of Harrisburg to work on a corridor that affects all of us. It has been a pleasure. The four municipalities have worked very cooperatively. It is fantastic and I hope that we can do other joint ventures into the future.

As you are aware, we have done a series of public meetings. The last one was the previous month and we held that at St. Margaret Marion Church in Penbrook and received public comments. We had identified four options and those we would like to present to you today so that you are aware of what is under consideration as possible alternatives that will come out in the final report.

I have with me in addition to Kathy Possinger of my staff, members of McCormick Taylor, Joe Bucovetsky, Jonthan Wetstein and Diane Crispino. I would like to turn it over to them at this point.

Mr. Bucovetsky: As Dan indicated, we've been working on the Walnut Street Corridor plan for sometime. We will be reviewing four alternatives that are currently under consideration and the direction for that Corridor. We are going to do some preliminary explanation as well. We will go over some project background. We did look at various alternatives together with the steering committee. The public was involved in that and the outline of our next step as well.

(A POWER POINT PRESENTATION WAS PRESENTED VIA THE HAND HELD MICROPHONE AND THINGS DID NOT COME THROUGH WELL. I'VE REQUESTED THE PRESENTATION FROM SKIP SO THAT I CAN PERHAPS PUT SOMETHING TOGETHER.)

Just a little on the background, the corridor is looking at the development of land use, and street improvements for the four municipalities. There from the state capitol all the way to the line??? Something focused on the west end not only on State Street, Walnut Street but also on Herr Street because of the transportation options that are possible with the consideration . Eastern end is basically a quarter mile on either side of the Jonestown Road, Allentown Blvd. Corridor and all the way up through Lower Paxton. These are the four participating municipalities which worked together and have a steering committee that we worked with. One of the reasons for doing this study is concerns for Penbook and its economic future. They are interested in a main street kind of atmosphere and a development in the business district. We are concerned because this is a major corridor for ?? We are interested as well to improve that. To show some of the organization we do have some of the four headings across the top for the steering committee, our project managers and in this case Kathy Possinger. We have the participation of a variety of different ???

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: We have a couple of Salary Board items. There is an original packet and then an addendum. From the original packet I would like to pull item #2. Do you have any questions on the Salary Board items? (There were none.)

In the personnel transactions, change #8 the rates were not included and I want to give you those. The current hourly rate is \$10.83, proposed is \$11.94, range 9334, and step 04. Do you have any questions on the items in the personnel packet? (There were none.)

Also included in the personnel packet, are the holiday schedule for 2007 and the payday schedule for 2007.

Mr. Haste: Are there any questions for Kay?

Mr. Hartwick: No.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci: You should have all received your packet yesterday. I have a couple of additions that I would like to pass out to you that were given to me late. In addition to the packet there was a requisition that came late yesterday for Juvenile Probation. It is a server that we would like to have added to the packet for approval next week to meet a deadline for a JCJC Grant. There is a memo attached to it. They don't need any special approval today but they want it included to be approved next week. It did not get to me in time to get included in the actual packet; but I will add it for next week if that is okay. If you have any questions on that Tom is here and he might be able to answer them.

The other item that I handed out was another BlackBerry request. This is a personal one for Diane Morgan in the Public Defender's Office. It is her own. She would pay the \$50 to hook-up to our system. That can go through next week for approval. Otherwise the packet is there for your review. If you have any questions today, I'll try to answer them.

Mr. Haste: Any questions?

Mr. Hartwick: No.

B. Recommendation for 2006 Bridge Maintenance Repairs.

Mr. Baratucci: The second part of my report is, you all should have received a letter from Herbert, Rowland and Grubic with a recommendation on a bid. We did a bid about a month ago for 2006 Bridge Maintenance Repairs project. We only received one bid. HRG's recommendation is that you reject that bid because they were not satisfied with

the cost and they would like to do a rebid. If you could take action today, that would be great unless you have any questions. That way we can send out a notice that we rejected the bid and are going to rebid the project.

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick to reject the bid received for 2006 Bridge Maintenance Repair Project; motion carried.

TRAINING PACKET

Mr. Haste: There is nothing in the training packet that needs approved today.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Haste: There is a request for a vote on Resolution No. 24-2006. Are there any comments? (There were none.)

A. Adopt Resolution No. 24-2006 designating the Dauphin County Community & Economic Development Office as recipient of Local Economic Development Assistance (LEDA) Program Funds for FY2006/2007 in the amount of \$84,078. **(***A VOTE IS REQUESTED 10/18/06)**

Is there a motion to approve?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco to adopt Resolution No. 24-2006 designating the Dauphin County Community & Economic Development Office as recipient of Local Economic Development Assistance (LEDA) Program Funds for FY2006/2007 in the amount of \$84,078; motion carried.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Foreman: There is nothing to add to the report.

CHIEF CLERK'S REPORT

Mr. Saylor: I have nothing unless there are any questions of me.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Haste: Is there anything to be brought before the Board?

Mr. Hartwick: I have two things. The first one is related to House Bill 1813 that was passed unanimously by the House last night and sent to the Governor. Let me just read to you the description and the purpose of the Bill which is long overdue for County Mental Health & Mental Retardation programs for a cost of living adjustment and for the promulgation of rules and regulations.

This legislation is a Community Mental Health and Mental Retardation Program Services and Supports Act. The intent of the Act is to provide ongoing annual cost of living adjustments for county mental health and mental retardation programs including early intervention. This legislation provides that the Secretary Department of Public Welfare must, at the beginning of each fiscal year, allocate to county mental health/mental retardation programs money that includes an aggregate amount of the funds not less than the aggregated amount allocated to the county programs prior years so it secures the current year funding and locks that in for the next year. It also includes an amount necessary to provide a full refunding of all the initiatives including the prior fiscal year allocations.

It keeps it at least a level funding and an amount necessary to provide funds for the cost of living adjustment, which is big and has not occurred in quite some time in the mental health system, which should be equal to the home health market basket index. I'm still trying to figure out exactly how that is gauged. I hopefully will be able to provide a report back to you at a future meeting. The home health basket index is a publishing federal register for the prior federal fiscal year in an aggregate amount allocated to the counties in the prior fiscal year plus the amount necessary to provide annualized funding for initiatives contained in the prior fiscal years allocations to the counties. It secures the actual current level funding and also this is going to provide that no longer has to be voted on an annual cost of living adjustment that is actually based on an index which conveyed to 4-8% a year is a significant increase and will be additional mental health dollars.

I think this is a step in the right direction. It is currently on the Governor's desk and because it has been unanimously passed I certainly will assist in supporting and advocating for its signing by the Governor.

The second update that I would like to provide is in relation to our Executive Commission on Drugs and Alcohol. As you are aware, last week we had some issues raised about a drug diversion program that was failed to be implemented that forced us out of a \$1.4 million grant and we had to return \$620,000 to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime & Delinquency. We are currently working through a job description that will be housed at the Prison. We are going to be actively pursuing and we have so far worked along with the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, Pre-Trial Services, and the MDJ offices to coordinate how we are going to manage the program and how we want to run the program. I was discouraged last week in just one day trying to acquire prison statistics and out of 3,700 sentenced inmates that went through Dauphin County Prison that are either level 3 or level 4 offenders who may be able to qualify for this program, out of those maybe 75%, the statistics say maybe 78%, 75% that would give us about 2,400 inmates that could have taken advantage of the program. Unfortunately, we were able to get 20 individuals in the treatment over the 18 months. That was certainly something this Board has been advocating for trying to get people treatment they need and trying to use every state dollar in order to try to divert people out of the Prison and hopefully we won't have them return to the County's doorsteps. This week I've also been having some discussions

and I read probably about three months ago, I requested and have been requesting for about one and half years, information from the Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol. That information was stalled and we actually received some of the information that we requested about 3 ½ months ago and as I was reading through the report which is entitled “Dauphin County’s Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol Treatment Needs Assessment for the year 2005 & 2006” something was brought to my attention that was rather alarming and in the report it says that juveniles are severely under represented in the data based on the fact that only 120 juveniles in the past full year have been entrusted by the Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol. Let me tell you folks in Dauphin County’s public schools in grades 7th thru 12th, we’ve got 19,000 students. That’s just in the public schools, not to mention the private schools, not to mention other individuals who may be eligible. 120 certainly is not doing the job of trying to go out and identify early enough the drug and alcohol needs that exist for the juveniles. In this report it says juveniles are severely under represented. What is the challenge here, what do we need to do in order to make sure that we get more kids to be assessed and into treatment? I pulled together about two months ago a meeting with the heads of Juvenile Probation, Steve Suknaic and Jeff Patton; heads of Children & Youth; and the Executive Director of the Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol and one of his staff members. We identified a number of the barriers. It has been the tradition of the Executive Commission and the Director to blame everybody else for not providing referrals and not getting people into treatment. It is everybody else’s responsibility. We did that and there were several things that we discussed. We set up a game plan, including changing assessment forms and JPO’s and changing the relationships that we’ve had with the caseworkers. One of the things that I’ve asked to do is to have at least one of the caseworkers at the Schaffner Detention Center which by the way had 1,158 individuals who passed through Schaffner Detention Center last year, to go out to begin programming and do assessments of who actually is out there right now and who could be eligible for treatment. To date, there are no caseworkers there, nothing has occurred, it is traditional when we try to define things even when the Commissioners try to pull all the right people together, the responsibility lies on the Executive Commission. We don’t even have a caseworker at the Schaffner Detention Center. I’ll tell you this Board is very passionate about trying to address the problems of drugs and alcohol. We’ve all probably had family members and we all probably know people that have been affected by this disease. \$4.8 million that has not been utilized by the County each year should be going largely into direct treatment. As I read these reports, assessments are down, we’ve got individuals in need of treatment, \$4 million dollars could be used in one municipality to help solve half the problems. We at the end of the year returned money to the categorical agency rather than using the money for treatment. I want the money from the Executive Commission and their ability to get that money into direct treatment into helping adults and kids who need treatment, do assessments, recommend in-patient treatment and out-patient treatment. I want to make this very clear, we are on one mission and one mission alone to get people into treatment who need help. That’s is the job of the Executive Commission on Drugs & Alcohol and based upon the cooperation that we’ve had so far, that is the job that the Executive Commission, their staff and their Executive Director had failed at accomplishing over and over and over. In the meantime, we try to address these issues

and be proactive from the Commissioners' level. I happened to come across the contract from the Executive Director which he has proposed for his own employment. It is interesting that we can be proactive about an employment contract and not be proactive about getting people under treatment. I'll tell you if you're in Health & Human Services and you are attempting to try to improve the quality of life of people we serve and we need to figure out ways to do that. If you are in it to make money and in it to protect yourself, you are in the wrong business. We're here to help people. We're here to try to use the money to get people into treatment. We're not here to protect ourselves. We're here to serve other people. That's the role of the public servant. Clearly in this case, I was amazed to see a proposed contract which certainly goes far and beyond what I've ever seen trying to be offered to anybody here in Health & Human Services. Again, this is only a proposed contract and anybody can ask for anything they want but I find it interesting that the term of the contract renews annually, the Executive Director is not able to be removed by the Commission, they are not given that option without paying a severance package which is an agreement of perpetuity of employment as the Director. The for cause definitions are written so much in the Executive Director's favor that effectively the only way the Commission can terminate for cause is if the Executive Director gets a felony conviction or is caught using an illegal drug. There is nothing the Commission can do about the incompetence. The Executive Director is not even able to be demoted. This type of one sided employment contract is practically unheard of in a small non-profit human service provider industry. This type of agreement is usually only seen in larger for-profit corporations and no other county human service director has such a contract. The severance for a constructive termination or termination without cause is the amount of his full salary, for all unused paid time off plus all company benefits including health insurance for the individual and the family for one year. Let me tell you, I would like to get this kind of contract. We should be basing what we do on performance. We should be basing what we do on the numbers of people who get into treatment. We should be basing what we do on the ability to service the most frail population who needs help the most. I come from a community where help is greatly needed. I know for a fact that every available dollar should be going directly into treatment. We need an organization that's going to be proactive, active people with all of our human service agencies providing drug and alcohol assessments and being able to be proactive in the Prison and Schaffner Youth Center and every location directly into treatment. I'm going to say it one more time, we need those dollars to go into treatment. \$4.8 million is not enough to service the people in Dauphin County and the needs of Dauphin County. We should not be saving the dollars for the end of the year to give to other health and human service agencies. We need those dollars to be planned for proactively used for drug and alcohol treatment. I'm going to say this over and over again until we get the message from the Board, the message to the Executive Commission that clearly that we got high expectations for that office, we have a great need and the people who need help the most in Dauphin County need that service.

Mr. Haste: Word has obviously gotten to the Prison Treatment Staff of the concerns of the new directions we have and last night we had a meeting out there. Their treatment staff is excited that finally we have an opportunity to have some input and say into this

and we were working on the job description of the position. If it is as it appeared last night, I think we're going to see some very positive impacts by involving Prison Treatment Staff. They're excited to have an opportunity.

Mr. Hartwick: Everybody is excited to have an opportunity to help.

Mr. Haste: Is there anything else to be brought up before the Board? (There was none.)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Transcribed by: Julia E. Nace, Asst. Chief Clerk
October 18, 2006