



DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

NOVEMBER 24, 2004

10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Julia E. Nace, Assistant Chief Clerk; Marie Rebuck, Controller; Robert Dick, Treasurer; Steve Farina, Prothonotary; Ed Marsico, District Attorney; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Mary Ann Boyer, Registration & Elections; C. Doran Vance, Jr., Esq., Solicitor's Office; Bruce Foreman, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Noel Falk, Special Projects; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Bob Burns, Director of AAA; Tom Guenther, Director of IT; Edgar Cohen, Director of Facilities Maintenance; Robb Wentzel, Director of EMA; Steve Howe, Director of Tax Assessment; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; August Memmi, Community & Economic Development; George Connor, Community & Economic Development; Phil Intreri, District Justices; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Diane McNaughton, Press Secretary; Lena Martinez, Commissioners' Office and Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office

GUESTS PRESENT

Steve Shaver, John Luciew and Johnny Rottin

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Haste: We have three sets of Meeting Minutes that we will address next week.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

PERSONNEL

Ms. Sinner: In the packet today, I have Salary Board requests. One is the reclassification of a position in the Controller's Office, as well as abolishing a director of communications position and a part time crew worker position.

There also is a List of Vacancies and Requests to Fill the Vacancies. In the New Hires Listing, most of those positions are part-time positions with no benefits for Spring Creek nursing and support services positions. I have a Changes Listing. The bulk of which are the transactions for the Controller's Office. Do you have any questions so far on these items?

Mr. Haste: This is sort of an administrative issue, when there is nothing listed here is that an elimination?

Ms. Sinner: Yes.

Mr. Haste: Maybe we should do something so it is clear on this. Even if you just put elimination after the title. So if someone in a year from now looks at the paper they know what it is.

Ms. Sinner: I have overtime reports. I also have an Addendum, which includes more Salary Board requests. One is to eliminate a full time custodial worker and create two part time custodial worker positions. There is a request to abolish four part time DUI booking officers in CID and a part time Seasonal West Nile Project position in the Conservation District. That was actually a duplicate position. I have a Vacancies Listing and a New Hires Listing. In the Changes Listing, #2 is for a transfer of a Spring

Creek employee from one position to another and the effective date of that transfer was November 22, 2004. If possible, I would like to request a vote on that today.

Mr. Haste: Is this in the Addendum?

Ms. Sinner: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Which one was it?

Mr. Haste: I don't have it.

Ms. Sinner: Changes in the Addendum.

Mr. Haste: My Addendum ends with the Conservation District.

Ms. Sinner: I'll give you my copy.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Which one is it that you are asking for a vote on?

Ms. Sinner: Item #2.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Do you have any background on what this specifically is?

Ms. Sinner: The Restorative Nurse Aide. We had created some positions – two Restorative Nurse Aides in August. They work in the Restorative Therapy area where residents go to therapy. The rate is lower. That is the way it is classified in the bargaining unit. They have to be certified as a nurse aide, but the position pays less. They work Monday through Friday. They don't have to work weekends.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I wasn't aware of any issues, but that makes it clear.

Ms. Sinner: I also have a request for payment of vacation leave that cannot be carried over by a Spring Creek employee who can't use up the time right now. She has been here over 20 years so she does accrue a lot. She is filling in as the HR Director right now.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm okay with that.

Ms. Sinner: This has been done on other occasions with other long term employees. I have a request from EMA for ten hours overtime and that is it.

Mr. Haste: Can you make sure, for next week, that I have a complete packet? The only thing that I have out of the Addendum is the Salary Board requests. I don't have all the other paperwork.

Mr. Haste: There has been a request to approve Item #2 on the Workshop Agenda Changes Listing Addendum for the transfer at Spring Creek.

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve Item #2 on the Workshop Agenda Changes Listing Addendum with regard to the transfer at Spring Creek; motion carried.

Mr. Hartwick: I have one question regarding EMA's overtime request. What is it for?

Mr. Wentzel: It is for our communication education training on the new updated version of the emergency police dispatch. These are the protocols that our call takers process when the 911 call comes in. This is the pre-scripted narratives that the call taker must follow to process the calls so it warns the appropriate dispatch. If it is determined to be a police event these are then the protocols they follow before we dispatch the appropriate law enforcement agency.

Mr. Hartwick: Couldn't you rotate this on a regular shift? Do you need overtime for this?

Mr. Wentzel: The original request was 45 hours and I sat down with my training personnel and we are doing some on shift training, considering the vacation schedules around the holidays and hunting season. We narrowed that down to ten. We cut that from 45 hours to 10 hours. That is the worst case scenario.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Haste: Mr. Baratucci is heading west.

Mr. Saylor: You should have a copy of the Purchase Orders. He did ask me to say that it is before you and he will be back next week. There are a couple issues that he is going to work out, but he said that was nothing of major concern.

Mr. Hartwick: As a point of interest, is there only one company that prints sample ballots or is that something that we could contract out to a Dauphin County firm?

Mr. Saylor: If Mary Ann is still here, I don't know if she could answer that question. (Mary Ann left.) I do know that our machines are old and very few companies still deal with those machines. I don't know if that has something to do with that or not. That is certainly something that we can find out and let you know next week.

Mr. Hartwick: I would prefer to keep the business here. There was one other concern, but I will wait until Randy is here next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The large purchase over budget, as it is indicated on this, was because it was placed in the wrong line item. That will be taken care of.

Mr. Hartwick: Maybe Carolyn can answer one question, as well. Video conferencing equipment and maintenance, is that a new set-up?

Ms. Thompson: Mr. Intrieri is here and maybe he can answer that question.

Mr. Hartwick: It is Page #9. I know we have had a lot of requests from folks in the upper end that would like to have the ability to do video conferencing. I wondered if that addressed this need or what this system does.

Mr. Haste: Actually they have that ability now. It is in the district justice's office. Is that correct?

Mr. Intrieri: Yes, although the police would like their own system, both to communicate with the DJ and down here for booking purposes. It saves them a substantial amount of driving time. It is about 45 minutes driving time. In particular, if a defendant makes bail they don't have to make the trip at all. If the defendant does not make bail, they continue to have to transport the defendant to the Dauphin County Prison, but they can do it on their time on one of their active shifts as opposed to holding an officer out on overtime. There is substantial cost savings there.

This item that you have in front of you for the video conferencing equipment and maintenance, I'm not a technician, but the router is the brains of the video system. This is what actually enables us to take our equipment and our connections and throw it out there to our video network. Our video network now includes every district justice, night court and central court. It also includes four police departments, which are obligated to share those with other departments as they see fit. Middletown has a site, Derry Township has a site and the City of Harrisburg has a site. Millersburg is working on one. The cost goes down with additional sites. So, hopefully, we will have one active in the upper end soon, if we don't already. This was originally bought approximately five years ago from a video grant from PCCD. Mr. Guenther is here and he probably can give you some of the more technical details. This is a critical piece of equipment and it is the brains of the whole system and this is what enables us to be able to connect outside of our network as opposed to connecting from say the Courthouse to this Administration Building.

Mr. Hartwick: So, this is a replacement?

Mr. Intrieri: That is correct. This router is currently down, which hampers the system. Parts of the system that are still running on telephone lines can still operate, but, for example, the Courthouse site cannot operate without this. Any system we have that is running off cable lines, as I understand it, cannot operate without this brain so to speak. It is an unfortunate occurrence that the thing went bad and cannot be fixed.

Mr. Hartwick: I guess the next logical question is since we have sought out PCCD funding in the past for this project, have we checked out any alternative funding, besides County General Fund dollars?

Mr. Intrieri: We have not for this specific piece of equipment. If we were to apply for a grant – a grant is normally project related to some new project. The State is very good with giving out money for initial funding on different things like this, but they don't promise to maintain the system forever, as you well know. We have not, although my instinct is that there would not be any grants available just to do a repair without a project connected. I don't think that is feasible.

Mr. Hartwick: Maybe expansion into Millersburg, they could pick up the repair with the warranty.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm not certain who can answer this the best. On Page 15, the maintenance contract, it doesn't specify what that is on. Does anyone know if that is a copy machine or a fax machine maintenance contract?

Mr. Hartwick: I will have to get the answer for you. It looks like it is MH/MR. I'll be glad to answer that next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: My only concern and I understand why we put maintenance contracts on copy machines, but I have a harder time understanding why we get maintenance contracts on fax machines that generally for the price of the maintenance contract you could at least replace the machine if not buy multiple machines.

Mr. Hartwick: I'll check and get you an answer.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The other question, Pages 12, 13 and 14, the Palms. Again, I'm a little confused why we are purchasing those now as opposed to using a \$7 calendar to keep track of things. I just want to make sure that it is appropriate. I understand if somebody is getting appointments scheduled in the office and sort of they pop in to sync and pop back out to the field, I understand why they need that, but I don't know that someone who necessarily works in an office everyday needs this equipment. I don't know where these are going.

Mr. Hartwick: Sandy and I did discuss these and they were justified and I will provide the rationale behind the justification by next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That is okay as long as you know.

Mr. Hartwick: I questioned this expense before she brought this to the Board. To be honest, I don't remember the exact justification, but I will be happy to provide to you the specifics.

Mr. DiFrancesco: If you are satisfied, I'm satisfied.

The other question is the rental of the postage machine, on Page 10? Is that a new machine or is it an existing machine?

Mr. Haste: It is the existing. The rental of the postage machine.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This is a Parks & Recreation postage machine.

Mr. Cohen: It is existing.

DIRECTORS/GUESTS

Robb Wentzel, EMA Director

Lease of land for prospective tower sites

Mr. Wentzel: This morning I share with you a map that is color coded. The green marks indicate existing tower sites that are currently operational or tower sites that we have physically secured through lease agreements. The black icons indicate proposed tower site locations that have not been secured. Recognizing that this project continues to be a subject of discussion and scrutiny and appropriately so. The concern from the emergency management standpoint and from just a total county communications perspective is we have approached the property owners. There is at least a verbal agreement if they are interested in supporting an agreement to lease land to the County to push forward in a public safety environment to develop the tower, the backbone for the radio system. We have not formally engaged those landowners. With the recent cycle that took place where we stepped back in January 2004 and did a review of the State proposal system, that delay ended up costing us a tower site in the southern end of the County, which caused us to go out and have to do additional propagation studies for coverage. Fortunately, in that case, as a result of those additional propagation studies we were in fact able to eliminate that tower site from the plan and find an alternative that would actually save us money. The concern now of going forward is especially in the areas closer to the more developed areas of the City and in the upper end of the County where there are only so many sites that are suitable for the volume of coverage that is specified. We are asking the Board's approval to go out, reach out, and formally engage those landowners to secure those sites that when a decision is ultimately made on which direction we are going to go with the radio project, that those commitments are already locked up and we are not having to scramble to identify locations for the tower sites in whatever solution we secure. The monies to secure those sites and to pay lease agreements are in the 2005 EMA budget. That is the extent of that on the tower sites.

The second document I shared earlier in the process and I will defer to Mr. Shaver from SSI. We did a reach-out to the municipalities to secure and have them forego continuing licensing and operating on the band of frequencies that we would need to move forward with the solution that is on the table at present. As with the tower sites, we also need to formally engage those municipalities to essentially lock up those frequencies so that when a decision is ultimately made and we move forward on a communication solutions that those frequencies are available and that the re-licensing of those frequencies will be in the name of the County and that the municipalities would forego operation and re-licensing of those frequencies. Right now, we do have

agreements in-kind or at least verbal commitments that as long as those municipalities are part of the communications project with their first responders they have been supportive of that, but we need to formally engage those and lock those up as well.

The third piece is because of the legal work that is required on both of these, we would request, recognizing that the resources of the County are stretched, a dedicated representative from the Solicitor's Office to support us in this endeavor.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I believe, Chip have you been involved?

Mr. Vance: Yes.

Mr. Wentzel: Chip has been very supportive of us, at least in the management of the lease agreements that we have currently secured for not only the existing tower site locations on the existing radio system, but also in securing some of the sites that we have procured and are pending development.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I believe that particular issue is good to go.

Mr. Hartwick: Explain to me the difference between the green and the black sites.

Mr. Wentzel: The green sites are the sites that we physically have secured and are locked up in an existing agreement. Most of those agreements, to the best of my knowledge, are either ten years with an option to extend for ten or they are a shorter lease, but there is an extension option and they range from zero cost on a monthly basis, because of the public safety benefits to I think the high value item is \$500 a month. The top site is Berry Mountain Site. That is one of the three sites where we have new tower structures, new infrastructure buildings and power supplies. Those sites are up and operational. So, a lot of that work has already been done. Ellendale is similarly a tower site as such. The large green icon is the site at the Com Center which has been discussed in the past where we have done the upgrades there, the grounding, the fiber optic. These sites, we are actively operating off of and that is not to say that some of them will require renovation. The Blue Mountain site is currently upgraded so additional work is required there. Those sites have been secured. The black icons are the sites relative to the technical solution that is on the table right now that is being considered. The black sites are the sites that we would need to secure land agreements for proposed development of the tower sites.

Mr. Hartwick: So, when we say we are financing the new investment that doesn't mean that it's still not going to be a considerable investment going out with land leases every five or ten years having to be renegotiated.

Mr. Wentzel: Correct, right now I believe our standard is ten years with a rollover for ten. One of the critical sites is the Peters Mountain site. The telephone vendor on that site is Verizon and because of the Appalachian Trail there is no additional tower site development permitted on that mountain and that site is a critical communications link

between the upper end of the County and the lower end of the County. We do have a verbal offer from Verizon to acquire the site as it exists and that offer came in significantly lower than what was anticipated. We have asked them to formalize that so we can present that to the Board so we can move on that site quickly. Absent that site, I would defer from a technical consulting standpoint, we would have issues in the redundancy in the linking of the upper end to the lower end and completing the project in the upper end of the County.

Mr. Hartwick: Could you provide a breakdown of each land lease and cost to the County for new versus existing sites? So you have a list of all the current land leases and then with the costs and expenses of these future land leases and the term of the lease.

Mr. Wentzel: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: With the licenses do we have to purchase those licenses or is that something that is voluntarily handed over?

Mr. Shaver: Basically there is no cost involved. What it is, is more or less an agreement between the political subdivision and the County. More or less it is kind of like a resource even though you can't see it, taste it or feel it. It is a resource that is necessary to operate any communications system. In this process what will happen, there is a basic agreement that was drafted by the prior Board. There is actually one agreement in place with the City of Harrisburg as far as their spectrum is concerned. In good faith we would like to lock the rest of these in. So, that if someone tried to license the frequencies it protects the County and the resource of the spectrum so they can actually, if at any given time the process moves forward as far as the system, you have the spectrum to do the system.

Mr. Hartwick: I can understand the urgency to lock up the actual land leases and locations with different uses being utilized for those land parcels and how essential each one of those are. Is there any body else out there trying to purchase the licenses from these municipalities? Or entering into agreements?

Mr. Shaver: They don't purchase. Yes, York County. We are trying to more or less fend them off as best we can. The resources are very small. They have done some things as far as the FCC with re-banding and re-licensing and trying to chop channels in half, but at the end of the day there is only a certain amount of spectrum available. In my mind it would behoove the Commissioners to actually try and lock these in too. There is no cost associated with it. Basically it is just new equipment between the County and the political subdivision that once and if a new system is built they would relinquish the license back to the County and they would be allowed to operate on the new radio system.

Mr. Hartwick: There will be no line item cost for licensing agreements with any of these municipalities?

Mr. Shaver: No, there is not.

Mr. Haste: What do you need from the Commissioners? Just an okay to move forward?

Mr. Wentzel: Yes, am I to assume that we are going to move ahead on the tower sites, but you are looking for information to support that decision relative to current costs and the supplemental costs.

(Commissioners gave the okay to move forward.)

Mr. Hartwick: What is currently budgeted for the project?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just one comment, the rescue incident the other day off the mountain. I just want to take a moment to commend the staff for what was a really challenging incident. There was a hunter who fell out of a tree stand about an hours walk into the mountain. There was rugged terrain and there were injuries that didn't make it a simple carryout situation. The initial request for helicopter support was not filled and through the proactive stance of the people at EMA they continued on to reach out to some resources that were not in this area. They reached out to the Coast Guard and the Air Force Search and Rescue in Langley and were able to get this guy off the mountain. It took a tremendous amount of time, but if it wasn't for the efforts of the EMA staff in going beyond the normal channels the poor guy would probably not have made it off the mountain. I believe, at this point, he is still in critical condition, but he is alive.

Mr. Wentzel: Correct, at the time of the incident there were concerns that it would not be a rescue that it would be recovery. Thanks for the comments. We got some good proactive out of the box thinkers in the COM Center and kudos to them for the job they did.

Robert Burns, Administrator, Dauphin County Area Agency on Aging

Request for CDBG Un-programmed Funds for a new truck to deliver Meals on Wheels programs throughout Dauphin County in the amount of \$36,745.00

Mr. Burns: Commissioners, I am here today to discuss and try to answer any questions that you may have about an application that the Area Agency on Aging submitted for un-programmed CDBG money. We have requested \$36,745 to be used to purchase a new truck to deliver home delivered meals as part of the Meals on Wheels Program. We currently have seven trucks, one is backup and if our proposal is granted by the Board we would use the new one as one of the main six vehicles to deliver meals and take one of them and sell it. It would upgrade the fleet and hopefully reduce expenses in the future on maintenance. We did apply for a grant from a private non-profit source for this same program and that was unsuccessful. So, CDBG was our second option.

Mr. Haste: I read your memo and I don't have a problem with it.

Mr. DiFrancesco: No problems, no questions.

Mr. Haste: The only thing I do have. The one that you want to sell, was that bought with Aging dollars? Is there a way that we could transfer that over to another department, if needed?

Mr. Burns: Yes, I think we probably can because of the loan value of it. I will check into that with the State Department of Aging.

Mr. Haste: If you would and then check with Edgar to see if there is a need elsewhere before we do it.

Mr. Burns: I don't know if you would want that truck.

Mr. Haste: We may not. I just don't want to give it away if it can be used elsewhere.

Tom Guenther, Information Technology Director
Historical Grant Application to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission for assistance with the County Archive

Mr. Guenther: I am here today to ask for approval for a Grant Application to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission for their assistance in establishing and setting up a County Archive. The Records Improvement Committee, chaired by Steve Farina, and I have been working on this for about the last six to nine months. We are looking to establish an archive over in the basement of the Veterans Building where we would centralize and preserve all the County historical documents. We, as a County, are eligible for \$15,000 matching grant with the Historical & Museum Commission. We would make application to them, which is due by next Wednesday. It is an electronic grant. I have everything written up. It is just an electronic submission. If anything comes back, based on your approval, I would then bring it back for your signatures. It is a matching grant. We would be using all non-general fund dollars to match that. This matched money would come out of the Act 8 Records Improvement Funds.

Mr. Hartwick: Did you talk to the folks who may be interested in trying to acquire the basement site for other reasons?

Mr. Guenther: We have had conversations and Mr. Farina had a conversation with Mr. Robinson last week. At this point in time, we were directed to move with the thought of the Archive going there. If it doesn't go there we would look for an alternative site. At least get this application in for the creation of the archive.

I just need the approval to move forward.

(The Commissioners were in agreement to move forward.)

Steve Howe

Abatement of a Property

Mr. Saylor: There was an item that I neglected to have added to the Agenda. It is a minor issue, but it deals with a Tax Assessment issue and a Church that is seeking an abatement. It has been kind of hanging around for a while. It has been reviewed by Solicitor Knupp, which gives you an indication that I have kind of left it sit on my desk. I asked Mr. Howe to come to the meeting this morning to present it to the Commissioners because it will take a decision by you.

Mr. Howe: The issue has been around since 2003. There is a Clean and Green Program, which is Act 319 that provides for a preferential assessment of properties if the property owner agrees to keep the property basically in agricultural production, agricultural use or forest production. In the event that there is a violation of that agreement in that the property owner sells excess property or property over and above which is permitted to be sold under the program, there is what is referred to in the Act as a roll back or violation of the program and taxes are imposed based on a seven year roll back and based on what the non Clean and Green or non-preferential assessment value of the property would be. We have a situation in Middle Paxton Township where property owners were enrolled in the program. The original application was in May of 1993. They have been in the program for 11 years. They turned and now sold an excessive amount, according to the agreement, of land to Zion Evangelical Congregational Church. The new revision to the Act, which is Act 157, now imposes the penalty for roll back interest and charges on the person who caused the roll back rather than the property owner. The Church technically caused the roll back and is now requesting that the County and the School District (there is no municipal tax) waive the additional interest that would be imposed on the additional tax that would be rolled back or imposed on the property. I had Solicitor Knupp look at the issue. My interpretation of the Act is that basically it is a municipal levy. The municipalities and taxing authorities political subdivision has control over their own tax, what you levy. The only thing the municipalities or taxing authorities no longer have control over is the interest on that particular tax amount or roll back. The Statute changed that in that the interest no longer goes to the municipality, but it goes to the Conservation District for their particular programs. The request came to us from Zion Evangelical Congregation, through their Attorney Mr. Adler. Mr. Adler understands that the Church will be responsible for paying the interest in the amount of \$855.79. The amount of tax or roll back that you are being asked to basically waive or forgive is \$3,265.78. What you are being provided with is basically a copy of my memo to Mr. Saylor detailing what I basically gave you the "Readers Digest" version of. The property was acquired for the purpose of expansion of their existing facility. Their existing Church is along McKelvy Road in Middle Paxton Township and they have acquired basically another 5.7 acres behind their existing Church property for existing future expansion. The property is not presently being used for church purposes and is not presently exempt from regular tax. But, what they are asking is because it will be put to a Church purpose that you waive the imposition of the roll back tax and they would agree to pay the interest to the County, which in turn will be turned over to the Conservation District.

Mr. Haste: When we do get roll back tax funds back, where do those funds go?

Mr. Howe: The County tax would go directly to the General Fund.

Mr. Haste: I had a request from the Ag Land Preservation Board to not do that and to actually put those roll back dollars, as well as the interest, into their program so they can continue to preserve open space. I don't think that is a bad idea. May be we can look to see how much comes in a years time.

Mr. Howe: It all varies from year-to-year depending on the violation.

Mr. Haste: Can I get a list of the last five years?

Mr. Howe: We can attempt to do that, yes. Typically what we do when there is a roll back is the roll back is calculated and the tax is turned over to the Tax Claim Bureau, simply for collection purposes and distribution to the various taxing authorities. In this particular case, we are simply being asked to waive the County's portion of the roll back tax itself. The School District has a similar request before them, but they are holding off in a decision until they see what the County does. This is not unusual. Unfortunately, I have no recommendation one way or the other. It is not my tax. It is the Commissioners' levy. You are being asked to simply waive the tax that would normally have otherwise been imposed.

Mr. Hartwick: It's appropriate for us to have some conversation with you and the parties involved before your request for a vote, am I correct?

Mr. Howe: Yes.

Mr. Saylor: The intention is not to have action today. I wanted Mr. Howe to present this to you.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have some questions on this. It is not a very big dollar figure granted and it is a church involved, but the bottom line is...

Mr. Hartwick: You don't want to set a precedent.

Mr. DiFrancesco: There is no legal claim to not paying the tax in this case. It is not like we are taxing a sanctuary or whatever. We are talking about land that would have been taxed anyway. We are talking about a program that seeks benefits because they don't sell the land. There is an incentive there not to sell the land and that is the whole point of the program. This request is really counter-productive to a number of things and I think we really need to talk about this. I'm troubled by this. I would go to bat for a church because of their community service any time. Right now I have some issues with this that I would like to get some more answers to.

Mr. Saylor: Steve approached me and asked me for direction on how to proceed with this. Given the nature, I thought it best that he do it this way and give the Commissioners time to review and ask any questions.

Mr. Howe: This is the first request that the County has received for such an action, because a revision to the Act just basically now allows the person causing the roll back to make such a request. This is the first time that we got that type of request before the taxing authority. If you have any questions now, I would be happy to answer them for you on this specific request?

Mr. Hartwick: I just don't want to open the flood gates for future requests.

Mr. Howe: The revision to Act 157 basically allows those folks that caused the roll back to go back to the taxing authority and basically ask not to impose the tax and that is what the Church has done. There are other additional leeways given in the Act to selling Clean & Green property. This is one of the accepted uses, but this amount of land that they sold violates or exceeds the additional allotment that is allowed.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would ask the Solicitor's Office to take another good look at it in terms of precedents and how the impact would be on other land arrangements.

Mr. Vance: Yes, sir.

Mr. Howe: I can provide to the Solicitor's Office a copy of Mr. Knupp's memo basically which was addressed to Mr. Tully.

Mr. Hartwick: Do we go back to 1974 for anybody who entered into the same agreement or is this from to date forward since there was a legislative change?

Mr. Howe: The Legislation did not change the roll back time period. The time period for roll back only goes back seven years. You can only collect seven years worth of back taxes. The amount that you are being asked to forgive is for six years plus the current year.

Mr. Haste: You will see that I get the last five years?

Mr. Howe: We'll see if we can come up with that number, yes.

Mr. Haste: Chad, you will stay on top of this and bring it before the Board at an appropriate time.

Mike Yohe, Budget & Finance Director
Presentation of the proposed 2005 Budget

Mr. Yohe: Commissioners, today has been advertised as the date that we will make the 2005 Proposed Dauphin County Budget available for the 20 day public inspection period. What I gave you is a book that contains everything. There is a summary in your

booklet, which I am going to go over. After that you have all the line item detail of the Budget, which will be made available to the public for inspection. I will go through the summary.

Page 1, the outline. We focused this whole effort, it started back in July of the General Fund, there are ten funds that operate in Dauphin County on the January to December calendar year. The ten funds are outlined at the top of Page 1. In addition to the General Fund, we have the Domestic Relations Fund, Liquid Fuels Fund, Low-Income Housing Fund, Hotel Tax Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Spring Creek Fund, EMA's Communications Fund, Solid Waste Management Fund and the Parking Garage/Human Services Building Fund. Back in July, packages were sent out to all the department heads. You received copies. They were due back in my office on August 20, 2004. Each of you received a copy of the submissions. We have since had public hearings where we went over in detail and you questioned all the department heads and the result of all the processing is before you today. If you look at this total on the first page, this chart, our current 2004 Budget for all ten Funds is approximately \$166 million. We are proposing a 2005 Budget of approximately \$165 million. One of the main reasons for the reduction, you can see on the Chart two funds are actually going down. Those are primarily caused by a reduction in a capital project funding that we won't need next year. If you look at the very first line, the General Fund is proposed to increase only 1.33% from our current 2004 Budget. I believe when we started this process that number was probably closer to 10%. So, there has been a lot of work to get to this point. In fact, the 1.33% increase is probably unheard of since I have been here for 20 years.

The second item on your Summary is just some key points, assumptions and other factors that are included in the Budget. As I just stated, we have a 1.33% increase in the General Fund. Another big factor that everybody always questions are the wages. What kind of wage increase is included? I got listings of all the union employees, which probably 60 to 70% of the County employees are covered under union contracts. Non-union, through this document, are budgeted at a 2% increase in January and a 2% increase in July, subject to maybe some personnel reviews between now and July. If you recall the 2004 Budget, we started the year with a \$1 million vacancy adjustment. That has been lowered to \$300,000 for next year. The primary reason for that reduction and I will skip down to Item #7, this Budget is proposed to eliminate 35 full time positions over 15 to 20 different departments throughout the County and a number of part time positions. Since we are eliminating all of these positions the rationale would be that may be we won't have the vacancies available to project out to next year. Also included in these figures for next year is \$1.4 million for a half year debt payment on the radio project that Mr. Wentzel was talking about previously. I wanted to point out that nothing is in here for a County-wide reassessment. We talked about that we may begin to set aside funds for that in the event that we would undertake that reassessment. I have in my projections, \$400,000 starting next year. That is what you are going to see throughout this whole report. Nothing is included in 2005 for a reassessment project. There are no new positions in 2005. One other factor that we have throughout this Budget is that we did implement co-pays for the first time to the employees that were

eligible. I guess some unions were participating and others were not. That is included, the co-pay rates and the non co-pay rates are included throughout this Budget for health benefit figures.

Item #9, we started back in July. Our deficit over a four year period was over \$50 million. We knew that coming into 2004. Our projections were showing, coming into the 2004 Budget, that we were facing a massive shortfall over the long term. Unfortunately, it wasn't addressed last year. We will take steps to address that this year. What we are showing now, this proposed Budget eliminates that \$50 million deficit and actually projects over a \$5 million Fund balance at the end of four years. We have gone through a lot of work to get to that point. All of these things are included in the various line items throughout this Budget.

We will switch to the second page. I'm concentrating on the General Fund.

Mr. Haste: Mike, I want to ask you a question so I make sure that I understand what you are saying and hopefully so the public and those that report this understand what you just said. Through this process, before we did this Budget, we were looking at a \$50 million deficit in four years. Through this process and the steps we took, we are actually going to see a \$5 million positive balance at the end of the four years. That is a swing of \$55 million to the positive.

Mr. Yohe: Correct.

Mr. Haste: If someone just looks at this year's Budget and says what happened, why is there still a tax increase if you made all these things? The answer is that we are looking long term. There is a \$55 million swing to the positive in the process.

Mr. Yohe: We have been criticized and our projections have shown and like I said earlier, our projections going into the 2004 Budget showed this long term deficit and we have been criticized and taken to task by the rating agencies as to when we are going to address that.

Mr. Haste: Our bond rating is important, because basically last year we were put on notice.

Mr. Yohe: Correct. Last year at this point in time our estimate for the end of 2004 was less than \$500,000, which did not even insure that we would make it through this year, which required a lot of action on your part earlier in the year to make sure that we would get through 2004.

Mr. Saylor: Already this year, the County of Allegheny and Philadelphia have seen their bond ratings degraded for cash fund balance reasons.

Mr. Yohe: This has been an ongoing concern the last three or four years.

Mr. Haste: How will we make sure that the rating companies know the action that we have taken? Do we notify them?

Mr. Yohe: I'm required to provide them with an estimate, which I will do.

Mr. Haste: I think that is something that gets lost in the shuffle, because where that benefits us and benefits the taxpayers if we have a good bond rating and we have to go out and do a project and we have to get financing we are viewed as a good customer as opposed to a bad customer, which saves us in rates and saves us in expenses. That only happens if you put money aside.

Mr. Yohe: That is correct.

The second page, I'm focusing this whole presentation on the General Fund, but you can see the General Fund supports all the other County Funds. This is just a summary of that support. All County tax dollars are deposited in the General Fund. They are redistributed as you see on the second page to Domestic Relations, we won't have HazMat transfer any more. Those employees that transfer covered shifted to the General Fund. You can see going down the line, the EMA transfer, the Communications Fund reflects the budgeted debt payment for 2005 that is included. The General Fund is pretty much picking up that additional debt if in fact when we go forward with that project. Most of the other funds have slight reductions or no increases. Spring Creek, we have been fighting through that all year. We settled at a projected transfer for next year of about \$4.1 million, which is showing a significant increase over the \$3.1 million that we started this year with. It is a significant decrease over our current estimate. We are right where I suspect that we would be. Hopefully we can do a little better in future years on that. We have a large reduction from the Capital Projects Fund. That transfer in this year's Budget was to cover the Courthouse Project overrun that we started the year with and the transfer of the Incinerator Bond Guarantee Fee. The Incinerator Fee was deposited into the General Fund and is budgeted to be transferred to the Capital Projects Fund for future projects. Do you have any questions on that page? Again, this is just illustrating the County's support to the other County Funds, whether they operate on a calendar basis or a fiscal basis. One thing that I would point out on this page, the Children and Youth transfer we are holding steady at \$6.7 million. That is our one wild card on the expense side. That is assuming status quo on the TANF Funding. If TANF goes away, our \$6.7 million figure could rise any where from \$9 to \$15 million. Apparently it is that much up in the air as to the impact. My latest estimates from Children and Youth is that could rise as much as \$9 to \$15 million if TANF went away.

Mr. Hartwick: We are working hard on that.

Mr. Yohe: As we need to be.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Just a question. Obviously this is going to bother me and there is not a whole lot I can do about it. The actual spending at Spring Creek this year is projected to be what?

Mr. Yohe: For the General Fund, it is just over \$6 million.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Even if we take away the money that we spent on the consultants to put the quality of care issues and the management of the facility back into shape, which I believe was about \$1 million. The actual spending out there for operations was still in excess of \$5 million.

Mr. Yohe: It would have still been probably \$2 million over our original estimate.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This document shows a budgeted amount of \$3.1 million when in fact that number should have been budgeted to the tune of \$5 million, because this is going to show an increase in spending at Spring Creek for next year when in fact even if you take away the consulting fees it is a significant decrease in spending at Spring Creek for next year.

Mr. Yohe: That is correct.

Mr. DiFrancesco: There is no better way that we can show that on this, I'm assuming because we are using budgeted dollar figures.

Mr. Yohe: You can always present this as a comparison over actual to projected or budget to budget.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In this particular case that budgeted amount last year, while it was an improvement of the original number was still a number that was fantasy land.

Mr. Yohe: As it turned out, yes. We were pretty confident going into 2004 that the number was pretty accurate.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Based on the information you were getting, even the track record of the prior couple of years showed that spending was way higher than that. Higher than the \$3.2.

Mr. Yohe: Yes. Any other questions on that page?

Mr. Hartwick: I got several, but not on that page.

Mr. Yohe: Quite frankly, the next several charts, these are still in my files from when Commissioner Petrucci was here. He liked to see these kinds of charts. It breaks up the monotony a little bit of just looking at numbers. The first one just illustrates the importance of the dependence of taxes. You can see how it illustrates that we depend heavily on taxes. These are all General Fund charts on taxes to support operations.

On the expense side, the main illustration I would say here are the 59% of our General Fund expenses go towards salaries and benefits. Again, really ties the Commissioners' hands when we got approximately 70% of our employees under union contracts that kind of spells out what we can and cannot do. Again, given that 59% of your budget that takes a lot of decisions out of your hands.

The next page just looks at revenues from a different standpoint as to what categories of government are providing the revenues. Again, taxes are there for the 71%, but you can see Human Services provides 1% into the General Fund, public safety provides 7%, judicial 10% and so on.

Mr. Hartwick: What would constitute general government?

Mr. Yohe: General government is Recorder of Deeds, all the operations IT generates, some revenue, as well as Public Defender's.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Fee revenue mostly.

Mr. Hartwick: So, it is that section that we should continue as we are working to enhance. That is the largest opportunity for us to try to get additional revenues.

Mr. Yohe: Other than taxes, yes there are fees that can be raised. This budget reflects a significant increase in some of the fees that we were allowed to raise also.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Did the percentage change much? In other words, the amount generated from fee as compared to?

Mr. Yohe: From percentage basis probably not, but it was about \$20 million up to \$20.5 million.

The last chart again is just comparing the same government functions as the expenses. What they bring in, general government costs 20% and brings in 10%, judicial costs 29% and brings in 10%, public safety costs 31% and brings in 7% so you can see the differences. Most of the gap is bridged by tax dollars.

Mr. Hartwick: Give me the breakdown on public safety? That includes what departments?

Mr. Yohe: The Prison, Schaffner and EMA.

Judicial would be Courts, District Attorney, Clerk of Courts, Prothonotary, Register of Wills and DJ.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Where do the commitment dollars come from then, if we sent someone to Schaffner that comes out of there, but where would it come from if we sent

them to a detention program some place else? Would those dollars also come from public safety?

Mr. Yohe: I'm not sure what you are referring to.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That money would come from General Fund?

Mr. Yohe: If we commit to some place other than Schaffner we wouldn't see any revenue coming back for those individuals.

Mr. DiFrancesco: These are the expenses though.

Mr. Yohe: The expenses would be from the Children and Youth Budget. The only way that you would see that would be in the transfer. That is part of the \$6.7 million that you are seeing as a transfer to Children and Youth.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The Children and Youth part of that would come under which category under this expenditure chart?

Mr. Yohe: Human Services is only the \$6.7 million transfer to Children and Youth. That would be part of the Human Services.

I'll skip Page 7 for now and go to Page 8. Pages 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 are just departmental summaries. It shows the current budget for each department to propose increase/decrease, percentage increase/decrease for both expenditures and revenues. Do you have any questions regarding that report? That is pretty much for public knowledge also, because they don't have to flip through the entire line item budget. They can see what each department is costing and bringing in.

Probably the most important sheet is Page 7. We currently have a millage rate in Dauphin County on property tax of 5.778 mills. This budget is including a millage rate of 6.876 mills, which is an increase of 1.098 mills or 19%. That is what is included to bring us to these numbers we have today. The library tax rate is currently 0.35 mills and there is no change proposed to the library tax. The final piece on this summary just shows the varying amounts of reassessment and what the current tax would be and what the proposed new tax would be and the increase and decrease. The average homeowner in Dauphin County, their average real estate assessment is \$100,000. We are looking at an average increase of about \$109.80.

Mr. DiFrancesco: You said the average homeowner is about \$100,000.

Mr. Yohe: That is my understanding. This whole summary will be included as part of the public display document. I'm open for any questions or comments that you may have. I have extra copies of the summary.

Mr. Hartwick: In the final projections, what do you project out for future County growth in the years 2005, 2006 and 2007?

Mr. Yohe: On the real estate basis about 1%. That is a conservative estimate.

Mr. Hartwick: What are you projecting for future growth of expenditures for those years?

Mr. Yohe: About 8% in 2006. The reason that is so high is we are going to have some increased debt payments next year, which are already scheduled. We also have the increase in the EMA debt schedule for next year. Other than that you are looking at probably a 3.5 or 4% increase. Bottom line total about 8% increase for 2006, 3.7% increase for 2007 and 3.8% increase for 2008 on the expenditure side.

Mr. Hartwick: The highlight of the budget, as I see it from this Board of Commissioners' perspective, is as you say the last twenty years you have not seen the Board of Commissioners hold County government to the growth that we talked about. It is a 1.3% growth in County government spending, which in my opinion is a real success for this Board. We took a look at keeping the budgets tight. We had cooperation from directors and we were faced up against a fiscal wall. Some real challenges that it was doomsday in County government. My concern is that we will move away from that and in projections we should try to be holding ourselves to the exact same standards as we move forward considering timelines of projects and also debt payments. I want to make sure that the number that we arrive at is talking about those same type of fiscal restraints in place in 2005, 2006 and 2007 in managing the County budget and this in no way means regardless of the percentage of tax increase, which I think is out for public display right now, but something that I don't have a huge comfort level with is something that we need to send a clear message that the same fiscal management that brought in that amount of County growth this year needs to continue to be applied as tightly against the same kind of standards that we put into place this year with directors. This in no way means there is going to be any different life following what other percentage of tax increases finally decided upon. I just wanted to hear what your projections were with the actual growth of County government in those years. Where is that listed, do we have that in our projections?

Mr. Yohe: It should be listed on the bottom of the page that you are looking at.

Mr. Hartwick: The reason for the high one in 2006 is a one year big lump debt service payment?

Mr. Yohe: The debt restructuring that we undertook in 2004 restructured 2005 debt. It did nothing to 2006 other than to level out a little bit. We are going to be moving back into a more flat debt payment starting in 2006. On top of that we have \$1.4 million budgeted for the one-half payment for EMA for one year. That figure is going to jump to about \$3.8 million next year. Those are the two driving factors as to why 2006 is showing such a spike.

Mr. Haste: When that happened, it would have been 2004, when we had to do the restructuring, when I was appointed and I came in here and I looked at the budget, there was a cash flow problem even though on paper it showed a balanced budget with a fund balance of \$24,000. In reality, cash flow wise, they were running out of money yet the end of October, the beginning of November. We had to restructure so that there was cash available to make payment, both salaries and bills at the end of the year. That restructuring occurred so there would be cash available for those payments. The philosophy was instead of putting it off 10, 15 or 20 years in the future, deal with it upfront and not just push off debt to future years. That was part of that restructuring. It was really to have money to pay bills.

Mr. Yohe: In 2003 and 2004, the County was in the exact same situation. The budgets that were approved did not in any way project out a manageable fund balance for the end of that year. Cash flow was a serious concern, each of the last two budget years.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, I just want to reiterate the amount that was actually spent in 2002, one was a 13% in spending, 2003 close to a 6% increase in spending and 2004, because of restructuring probably was about 14%, increase in spending this year we are at a remarkable 1.3% overall increase in this year's budget. It says 2.49%, what is the difference between those two numbers?

Mr. Yohe: This chart that you are looking at compares actual to budget as opposed to budget to budget. We are projecting to come in under 2004 Budget. Therefore, your percentage increase would be smaller.

Mr. Hartwick: And therein lies the point to continue the same fiscal management that we had cooperation with in this year and continuing on as we move forward is essential to the financial stability of Dauphin County and it is something that I feel confident that we are going to continue to move forward and employ those tactics and have the same type of cooperation as we take a look at other essential government services. We are going to be considering all options if they are not money makers we are going to continue to move forward in that direction with trying to either eliminate or maximize revenues from those spots with future cuts in mind. I don't know if we will be able to address the structural budget deficit to minimize those services that are not producers and are not mandated to provide and figure out ways that we can better manage government in those ways. I would like to see, as we move forward, percentage of tax increase is still something that I am not completely at ease with, but as we move forward even potentially with the same prudent fiscal management being able to be in a position to not only develop a positive fund balance as a result of this budget, but also to be able to look at the taxpayers several years from now and maybe prolong any future tax increases as a result of the same type of management.

Mr. Yohe: The 3% in 2006, 2007 and 2008 would require again there are no provisions in here for any other position eliminations. We eliminated the positions in 2005, now that is just normal growth on those positions. To get to attain another 1.33 you are

going to probably be looking down the road at something similar to what we did this year. That is an option. That is probably the only way that you are going to get down to 1.33, is with those types of hard decisions.

Mr. Hartwick: You can expect that same type of management and nothing changes as a result of us putting the financial house in order and that will continue to be the position of this Board to continue to move in that direction. I'm looking at my other two colleagues and I hope we have that same idea. Just because we are putting the house in order now everybody can gain positions and we can bring people back into County government. We need to continue that same prudent fiscal management and it would be my goal to keep growth under 2% every year.

Mr. Haste: If you remove the debt out of this quite frankly, you look at future projected increases as a big chunk of the increase, that doubles.

Mr. Yohe: If you remove the debt, this is projecting under 4% growth on operations from this point forward. You can see historically there haven't been too many years where it has been under 4% growth.

Mr. Haste: Unfortunately, there is not a whole lot that we can do with that. That is something that we inherited.

Mr. Hartwick: Future debt is.

Mr. Haste: Correct.

Do you have any other questions of Mike?

Mr. DiFrancesco: No questions, just a comment. I think it is important to note as we actually lay this on the table and we look at the information that you laid out to us today that when this Board, each one of us, decided to come to Dauphin County we were looking for a couple of things and maybe those are the same things that they don't normally get out of elected public officials and that is to come in here, you hear the rhetoric all the time run it like a business, the fact of the matter is that we have spent the last year trying to put a disordered house into order and I think we have accomplished that. Upon achieving that order it gave us an opportunity to take a hard look at just how big Dauphin County government was, where we were being efficient and where we were not, we held the spending very tight. I want to commend the directors that did such a fine job with the vacancy adjustments throughout the year and made do. Again, I want to give credit to the directors who at the end of that year through proper evaluation basically came and tried to assist us with decisions that were very difficult. We were talking about layoffs and eliminating vacancies and reducing the size of government. It is never easy putting people on the street, but the bottom line is that through team effort of all the directors of all the departments we were able to come up with what I believe is a responsible budget in making those decisions. I think this budget gives proper consideration for the future as well. Bottom line is that more than

likely our TANF funding is going to go away and that will be a major hole in the budget that really we are going to have to address. We are talking, as you said, between \$5 and \$14 million worth of impact on the budget. As we made the cuts and made the decisions we considered that priorities are going to change because of those funding stream changes. We are going to have to be much more innovative than we have even been and we have a pretty good track record of innovation when it comes to Children and Youth Programs and when it comes to handling juvenile crime. The bottom line is this budget is a thoughtful document. The changes that were laid on the table were not knee jerk, but were very long term considerations, not just for the immediate reaction of today's budget, but looking at that four/five year cycle, long term issues and bringing stability back to Dauphin County. Again, I think this budget does that. We realize that there is a lot of pain in this budget. We realize the tax increase that will be used to fund this budget is not easy for the homeowners. We realize there are folks that we have to let go from Dauphin County government, that is not an easy decision. There is certainly going to be pain felt within those families. The bottom line is that the public and the constituents in this County asked us to come here to do a job. I think we have done that job and we will continue to do that job. We will continue to run this government efficiently. We will continue to find ways to cut expenses and there are things if we look at Spring Creek at this point, we made some gains this year in getting that building under control. We will continue to make gains. We will continue to shave off. My goal over the next year is millions of dollars off of that budget out there. There are still gains to be made. As Commissioner Hartwick mentioned, this Board is extremely committed to making sure that every good deed that we are starting right now and the successes that we are having continue. We want to make sure that when this Board is done that we entrust this County to the next Board that it is in a good solid position that it is fiscally sound and that the reserves are built back up that we can meet the goals of leaking roofs and capital projects that are necessary. You need to have money set aside for those kinds of projects. I think this is a good sound budget and I think it is one that I hope the public will review.

Mr. Haste: Can I have a motion to place the 2005 Budget on the table for public inspection?

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco

Mr. Hartwick: Can I ask for clarification?

Mr. Haste: Sure.

Mr. Hartwick: I still don't have a comfort level with the total percentage of tax increase and this does not mean that I am voting on a 19% tax increase.

Mr. Haste: Correct, this is to lay it on the table.

Mr. Hartwick: I just wanted to be clear on that.

Mr. Haste: We will take final vote on December 15, 2004.

As noted above, it was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board place the 2005 Budget on the table for public inspection with the final vote being held on December 15, 2004; motion carried.

Mr. Yohe: The Budget will be available at the 4th Floor Reception Desk. I would like to thank each of you. In my experience far more involvement than I am used to out of the Commissioners and that is good. You have been very responsible in responding to questions and I have a very good comfort level that the three of you know what is in this budget as opposed to may be some budgets that were put out in the past. Thank you.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Haste: There is one item that we need to take a vote on. This is the cancellation of a Consultant Dietitian Service Agreement between Spring Creek and Leslie Bosse.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This will immediately save the County money if we vote on this today. We do have the necessary knowledge in-house so we can begin to save money right away.

It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve the cancellation of a Consultant Dietitian Service Agreement between Spring Creek and Leslie Bosse; motion carried.

Mr. Haste: Any discussion needed on any of the other items?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have two items that we had hoped to get put on the Agenda today, in addition to some of the other Spring Creek matters on here that for various reasons could not get on today's calendar. One of those items is the addition of another agency provider. The concern was that through the holidays it is sometimes difficult to get enough staffing levels with vacations and everything. We may be coming back next week at the Legislative Meeting with a request to vote on something that was not on the Workshop Agenda to add another provider to our list of agencies.

Mr. Haste: Is this for nurses?

Mr. DiFrancesco: Yes. This is the one thing that is not on here that may be time critical that we might have to move on.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Vance: I don't have anything unless you have a question about the report.

Mr. Haste: Number 9 on your report. Who pays, us or them?

Mr. Vance: I just received this yesterday so I cannot honestly answer that. If you bear with me I will look. It would appear that they would be the one paying. Not much, but some revenue.

Mr. Haste: I wanted to make sure that we weren't.

Mr. Vance: No.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor: I have nothing except to remind you that we do have a brief Executive Session after we are done today to discuss some legal issues.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

(There were none.)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(There were none.)

Mr. Haste: I just want to remind everyone that we need to go into Executive Session and we must do that quickly because we have a Retirement Board.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Transcribed by: Richie Martz
printed 1/28/05