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MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.
MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve the October 29, 2014 Workshop Meeting Minutes and the November 5, 2014 Legislative Meeting Minutes; motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor reported that there was one Executive Session held this morning regarding personnel and litigation.

ELECTION BOARD

A complete set of Election Board Meeting Minutes are on file in the Commissioners' Office.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Robert Burns, Director of Area Agency on Aging; J. Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; and Lee Markosky, General Manager of the Commissary Division, The Nutrition Group

1. Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County and Nutrition, Inc. *(A Vote is Requested)*
2. Transition of the AAA Meal Program

Mr. Burns stated that with him today is Lee Markosky, General Manager of the Commissary Division of Nutrition Group, as well as Dave Puskar, District Manager for the Nutrition Group. On October 15th, the Board accepted the bid of The Nutrition Group and instructed them to negotiate a contract. For the past month, they have been working on a transition plan in the event that the Board determines that they would like to accept and award the contract today. Over the course of the past month, they have tried to work out a transition that will go smoothly for the clients, volunteers and coordinators. A group from the County took a trip to their facility. Commissioners Pries
and Hartwick were in attendance, along with volunteers who deliver the meals and some members of the Aging Advisory Council. They have been coordinating with the volunteers and the folks that do the deliveries for the County to apprise them that this change is being considered. He believes that the plan is a good one and if the Commissioners vote today to approve the contract with Nutrition Group, the change would be effective December 1. Mr. Markosky can address any issues or questions the Commissioners might have about their capacity to deliver the meals and prepare the food. Nothing will change for the volunteers. They will continue to make all the deliveries as they do now. All of the drop-off sites will be the same. At Commissioner Hartwick’s direction they formed a Food Quality Assurance Committee that will meet regularly with the Nutrition Group to address any questions or concerns about menus. That committee will consist of clients, volunteers who deliver the meals, senior center directors and those people who are involved in the day-to-day operations of the meal program.

Mr. Pries asked if Mr. Burns could provide a brief summary of the efficiencies that will be provided, as well as the cost savings on an annual basis.

Mr. Burns indicated that it is anticipated that Aging will reduce expenditures next year by $297,000. They arrived at that figure by taking the contract rate with Nutrition Group, which is $5.57 per meal, which is $1.80 cheaper than what is currently being paid. Currently the cost is $7.37 per meal. Approximately 165,000 meals are delivered per year.

Mr. Pries stated that the plan is for that $297,000 to go right back into the Area Agency on Aging services.

Mr. Burns stated correct. Those funds will provide additional personal care/in-home care for clients and more people will be receiving meals.

Mr. Pries stated that based upon the tour that both Commissioner Hartwick and he attended and the sampling of the meal, the folks were very impressed with that. The facility was very clean, organized and orderly. He believes that Dauphin County is only one of three counties in the State that does its own service. Per Federal regulations, counties are not supposed to be in the business. Now is the right time to make this move in a positive direction. He applauded Commissioner Hartwick for helping the individuals look for other work and the Board is doing everything it can to assist them in the future to find new employment, hopefully right here within Dauphin County.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that the realized savings for the first year, $297,000, that does not include the severance costs that will be paid out.

Mr. Burns stated that for the first year he is going to assume that it will break even. July 1 when the new fiscal year hits, that is when they will begin to accrue the savings.
Mr. Hartwick stated so the idea of providing additional services with those resources is not going to happen within the first year. On the Agenda, is an Agreement for listing the kitchen. He talked to Mr. Burford about the auction for the equipment. Any of those dollars that would be realized through that transaction would be directly placed back into direct services for the aging clients.

Mr. Burford indicated that is the understanding and the direction that he understands the Board wishes to take.

Mr. Saylor asked Mr. Burford to discuss the listing.

Mr. Burford indicated that the property itself has been appraised. There is a listing on the Agenda for approval to have it listed with a local realtor. That listing will go up December 1, 2014. The asking price for the property is $599,900. The County has reserved the right to any interested party who wishes to purchase the property would also have first right to the equipment. That would be an additional charge on top of the listed price.

Mr. Hartwick asked if the County is going to be holding off on the sale of the trucks and larger amounts of equipment until the market can be tested related to the sale of that facility.

Mr. Burford indicated that the County is splitting off the small wares from the vehicles. The vehicles will be auctioned off on December 9th at a local auction house that the County has used in the past. There are eight total vehicles. One vehicle is going to be retained as part of the pool car fleet and the other seven vehicles (step box trucks) will be auctioned.

Mr. Hartwick stated that he was approached early on about the equipment. He asked where the auction will be taking place.

Mr. Burford stated that it will be held in Grantville. It is an auction house that the County used in the past. The name changed. It was Manheim and now it is Total Resource Auction. He has some contact information for those interested.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he was going to start out on a strength-based way as it relates to his visit. Ultimately it is the volunteers that really allow this service, which is essential to seniors. If minimum wage was paid, the County would not have the resources to provide to seniors to be able to do the meals on wheels. In order for them to understand the transition and to be a part of that transition, it was essential to gain their buy in. Their feedback was positive related to the visit. They are going to be watchdogs related to quality of service, the quality of the meals and the cost. All of those things are essential in this decision-making process. The Committee that is going to be established of consumers, this is a great opportunity to gain some local understanding of the meal process, to engage the volunteers in an even more direct way. He asked where the County is at with the creation of the food service committee.
Mr. Burns stated that two members of the Aging Advisory Council have indicated that they would like to be part of it. Letters are going out today to the coordinators from each of the 40 areas within the county asking them if they would like to participate, as well as to each senior center that is a congregate meal site.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it was very clear on Nutrition Group’s willingness to be open with the structure that is provided to other counties and the ability to do feedback. He asked if there was a set time.

Mr. Burns stated that he would like to have the committee in place by the end of December and the first meeting to be held sometime in January. Going forward the meeting might be bi-monthly or whatever is appropriate.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he has been clear about his concerns related to the process. The County was recognized Federally as one of the best private partnerships and the ability to tinker with that is a concern of his. He knows what Commissioner Haste is going to say about the one bidder process. The County needs to manage those costs moving forward. The Board has looked internally at ways to restructure the services to ensure that the growing senior population has access to the most essential and core services, which are meals on wheels and in-home care, both of which are critically important to try to allow for seniors to continue to move in that direction of the independence that they should be able to have and not being forced out of their own home. The question about trying to maintain and control those costs and to be a watchdog moving forward is something that he is going to be very attentive to and be a part of the process, even sign up to be a part of this food service committee. There is a cost of living escalator that has been negotiated as part of the contract. The contract is a three-year contract and the increase is based upon the CPI.

Mr. Burns stated that the CPI food or 2%, the lesser of those two figures.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it is important to note that it is not just when the costs are incurred. Nutrition Group is going to have to continue to try to meet those obligations moving forward, which makes him feel more comfortable related to the actual savings the County is going to realize. That can only be done for two years. The Board is committed to the employees that have been quality employees of the County and provided a longstanding service to attempt to find opportunities for them within the County. It is something that is an ongoing process. As attrition occurs the Board wants to give priority to those individuals. It was well done. He looks forward to see how this progresses and in particular the quality of meals. If they match the quality of meals that he received when he took the tour, the Board should be receiving some good feedback from the consumers.

Mr. Markosky stated that is their goal to serve them.
Mr. Haste stated that when Commissioner Hartwick talked about being a watchdog, he believes that every senior that receives a meal will be a watchdog. He has already heard from the senior hotline. The anticipation is pretty high. As soon as the County started talking about getting better meals that piqued the interest. Hopefully the County is able to keep up to that. The minute that the meals are not at the level that the seniors expect, the Board will hear from them. The seniors deserve a good quality meal. They have gotten good meals in the past, but they were not always pleased with the meals. He is looking forward to it. With the ability to put that savings back into the senior community is great. Every single year the County struggles with trying to come up with the dollars that are needed to provide all the services that the Board would like to provide and this will help in that process. This is a good partnership. It too is a public/private partnership that will work very well.

Mr. Markosky stated that the Nutrition Group is looking forward to providing this partnership as well.

It was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County and Nutrition, Inc.

Question:  Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – No; motion carried.

B. William Jones, General Manager; Tom Young, Assistant General Manager; Randy Lease, Director of Finance; and Bob Philbin, Director of Planning, Customer Experience & Public Information - Capital Area Transit

1. 2015 CAT Budget

Mr. Jones thanked the Commissioners for having him here today. He was joined by Tom Young, Assistant General Manager, Randy Lease, the Director of Finance and Bob Philbin, Director of Planning, Customer Experience & Public Information.

Recently CAT has been under a great deal of criticism in the press and from numerous individuals about a lot of different issues. The facts that were quoted came out of their NTD Report based on the fiscal year 2011/2012. In order to give the Board some perspective of what was in there, he needs to step back and give a little bit of history.

As the Board knows and with Commissioner Haste being the Chairman of the MPO, when Act 44 passed in 2007 it was built as being a predictable and growing source of revenue for transit systems. When that was created, his predecessor created three new pieces of service – the Route 81 to Shippensburg, Route 322 to Hershey and the Route 322 to northern Dauphin. These routes were created with using funds that could be used for three years with the anticipation that the operating funds would be growing. Act 44, when they didn’t toll Interstate 80, the funds didn’t grow. In fact they actually went down as part of the synopsis. They were level for several years and did in fact
prove what he was saying. When this new Administration came in 2011, they went through and started looking at the issues that were going on. They found out that the Federal grants had been spent ahead almost two years to cover the services. They found out that numerous Federal and State grants hadn’t been invoiced. CAT had $4.5 million in lines of credit that were nearly maxed out and that was on top of the numerous operating, maintenance, administrative and marketing issues. In response to that they met with the Board in January 2012. A lot of the issues that CAT has been beat up on in the press were the exact same issues that they told the CAT Board almost three years ago. In response, the CAT Board developed a strategic plan. CAT had to reduce service. Every time that is done it has to be done very judiciously. That ride is somebody’s lifeline to either work, nutrition or the outside world. They reorganized completely. They cannibalized the capital program for a number of years so that they could get the house in order. They adopted a pay as you go attitude. They were forced to use more local funds beyond the Act 44 minimum share to balance the budget.

Where CAT is now – Act 89 has finally passed. One of the reasons they didn’t make deeper cuts is because new transportation funding was coming. The money is starting to flow. They have done a great deal of outreach into the public. Mr. Philbin and his team have been going out doing CAT Connect throughout the whole service area. The people have a great deal of input into the system. The fixed route trips, last fiscal year, were 2,666,959 and another 194,285 in shared ride trips, which is about 1.5% increase over the year before. Wages and salaries were reduced from $8.3 million in 2011 to $7.9 million in 2014. Interest expense was cut from $97,000 down to under $12,000. Right now the lines of credit are zero. The capital grants and the Federal grants are in line. The Federal funds come out in early October. They are applying for them right now. Traditionally they would line up with the next July fiscal year. CAT was almost two years ahead on those grants. Now, CAT will not start spending that money until July of next year, which is a huge improvement. They decreased major breakdowns from 455 in 2012 to 159 in 2014. There is a new labor agreement. The wages in there met or were less than the CPI, but the Union worked very hard with them. They controlled costs on healthcare to the point that they actually decreased the cost with maintaining the same level of benefits. They heightened their awareness of attendance. CAT has taken a lot of heat about the attendance of the drivers. He also looked at the management team too, because through the years it is the unsaid messages. Their labor agreement said it was okay not to come to work. They won these benefits for many reasons to protect the jobs of their union members, the people who live and work in this region. They are trying by increasing the education to make them understand how important it is for them to attend. The people of this region depend on them to come to work. It also helps on the bottom line. He had a discussion with the union president, John Keller, yesterday. Mr. Keller has been telling people how important it is to come to work. The labor agreement was signed over the summer, but all the attendance programs could not be put into place until October of this year. For the month of October, the report offs were 132, which are down from 190 the previous month. It was 179 in October of 2013. One month doesn’t prove a trend. Again, they need to increase the awareness to the union members of how important it is to come to work.
There is a lot going on moving forward. They need to formalize a cost containment plan. They have asked PennDOT for some technical assistance. With regard to the pension plan – there is a pension committee which is made up of management and labor. The actuarial report of 2013 it was approximately 73% funded. This past year it was up over 80%. It is getting better. They are working with an outside firm to strengthen it even further. They are fulfilling their fiduciary duties as pension board members, but also guaranteeing to the participants that they have a safe plan. It is a conservative plan with a multiplier of 1.4, which is very reasonable.

Healthcare is going to be another issue. They are going to join hands with the union to see how they can maintain a quality level of care yet control costs. Everybody is projecting 8 to 10% increases. CAT was the first company, not only public, but also private to adopt an HSA. They saved almost $500,000 in the last five years on the plan alone. The union has stepped up to the plate. There is a lot of work to do to make sure they don’t get any cadillac taxes moving forward. They do have a good plan, but they have to make sure that it is right sized and proper for moving forward.

The Federal money keeps going down, but they keep increasing all the Federal requirements and the State now with their requirements, CAT has to make sure that they are meeting all of that to keep the house clean and are meeting all the State and Federal regulatory requirements. Labor negotiations will start after the first of the year. They are looking at the service to see how it can be reengineered. The footprint of CAT looks very similar of what it looked like in the 40’s, 50’s and 60’s. An example – you are standing in Union Deposit and you can almost see Colonial Park from where you stand, but to get there you have to take a bus all the way to downtown Harrisburg and then come back out. They need to find a way to reallocate the resources that they have now to do a better service. Right now CAT is working with PennDOT on a new route, which has been termed the “Southern Dauphin Circulator” to connect Middletown, Hummelstown and Hershey. They need to find ways to work more cooperatively with the neighboring transit systems, whether that is through consolidation or cooperation. Act 89 does provide waiver of local share for cooperative agreements. Over $65,000 was saved on the audit. They did a joint RFP with Rabbit Transit in York for auditing services. They are going to do that again. This year they will also reach out to Lebanon and possibly even State College. Fares – are they equitable. They know they have some issues. PennDOT has mentioned that on some of their long distance fares, the State termed that they might be giving away some of that. They are looking to make sure that they have the data to substantiate, but they do have to make sure that the customer is paying their fair share, but that it be done in a fair and equitable fashion. When he came to CAT the technology was terrible. Right now they are on the verge of a major transformation of CAT. They pulled CAT into the 21st century. After the first of the year, you will be able to see where CAT buses are on a cell phone. They installed new scheduling software to help make the routes more efficient. They will also be able to link that up with the AVL system where they will know where all the buses are and will be able to share that with the customers. They did five year capital and operating budgets looking forward they are balanced. They still have a lot of work to do. They
have a five year mass transit operating agreement that this Board agreed to with the
other two funding partners. As they get into this current funding request, the amount of
Dauphin County was $372,294 ($337,450 is the County’s share for operating Act 89
and then there was another amount that wasn’t approved last year of $34,844.
Cumberland County said that they didn’t want to pay theirs. That is an issue between
the funding partners. That is the request from CAT at this time. He asked the
Commissioners if they have any questions.

Mr. Haste commended them for making some steps forward. CAT has done fairly well
at trying to address some of the problems. He is a little disappointed that part of the
problem is what he calls the use of monopoly money. When he took over as Chairman
of HATS, Representative Keller had been chairman prior to him, they warned everybody
at that point in time not to use those Turnpike tolling dollars, because they weren’t real
money. CAT is in the same boat as the school districts with spending money that they
knew they weren’t going to have in the future. That is poor management to spend
money that is a whim. There are other funding sources now that will hopefully catch up
to that, but for that to be part of the reason CAT is in the hole is bad management.
Some of the Board members, things have gotten a little hot for everybody, but on the
other hand to some degree this is good for all, because the reason it is going that way is
taxpayers have said they are paying enough so they don’t want to be subsidizing more
things so this Board is hearing from them and this Board appoints the CAT Board to
keep an eye on management and in the past that has been a little cozier of a
relationship than it is now. This Board is asking the CAT Board to step up and keep a
good strong handle on what is going on and Mr. Jones is being asked to do the same
thing through the management staff on the budget and the labor staff with the drivers.
In the long run, even though it is painful for everyone, it is a good thing for the end user
as well as the taxpayers. Even though it is difficult, don’t get frustrated. That is part of
why this Board is here. Hopefully CAT doesn’t get into that boat again where CAT uses
funny money to try to run operations.

He has had some discussions regarding the lower loop. He talked to some folks from
SARAA. He really would like somehow over the next few years to get a greater
presence for CAT at the airport. When you look at economic development and start
talking about driving people, one of the concerns is that people can fly in then what do
you do from there. He has heard from SARAA on why there isn’t a better presence.
Part of it is security reasons. Somehow that needs to be addressed to heightened
CAT’s presence there as well. He will be happy to continue to work with CAT on that
issue.

Mr. Saylor indicated that SARAA is the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority.

Mr. Haste stated that when Mr. Jones mentioned the healthcare benefits, the cadillac
plan idea is not something to be taken lightly. Under the Affordable Care Act, that is
getting to be a point that everybody has to take a look at. He knows from the County’s
perspective is on the tax moving forward could be pretty significant. He asked if CAT’s
plan is not a cadillac plan. The way this system is set up the coverage will go up greatly
than by what the index is. The index is set as CPI. Most of the times healthcare benefits go up greater than that. There will come a point in time where even if you initially are not in the cadillac chances you will be. When you hit that cadillac plan it is significant costs.

Mr. Jones indicated that they are aware of that. On a pure cost standpoint, CAT knows going forward that they have to be fully aware and need to be exploring all options for containing those costs. The union is fully aware of that. They realize the current plan has to be looked at seriously.

Mr. Saylor indicated, for the public, that the discussion is regarding the Affordable Care Act or O’Bama Care has stipulations on what they consider to be rich healthcare plans, no copays or little copays. They are viewed as a cadillac plan and starting in 2018 they are going to tax it. It is the cost of the premium that is the driver for the cadillac plan.

Mr. Haste stated that it is the Unaffordable Care Act – he said as anyone that is in business, it is unaffordable. Anybody who has a large budget and large number of employees needs to take a hard look at it.

Mr. Jones indicated that he is taking a hard look at it.

Mr. Haste stated that in doing some research under the Federal legislation, he thinks it says that the advertising costs can be counted as local match. It doesn’t appear that CAT counts that as local match. He asked why and what is done with the advertising dollars.

Mr. Jones stated that the advertising dollars do go into the general budget, but they historically have not been used as match per se. He believes that is on the Federal dollars. He is not sure if that counts towards the State dollars. He won’t misquote. CAT has also been able to do some things to minimize the County’s output on capital projects by being able to fund a lot of the local share on capital projects through State funds and minimize the local input.

Mr. Haste asked if that could be classified as local match, could CAT draw down additional Federal dollars.

Mr. Jones indicated no, not at this point in time. The Federal dollars come off of a formula and CAT draws down the maximum amount that they are allowed at this point in time.

Mr. Haste stated that because they are not used, it does put more of a demand on the funding partners, since they are not counted as local match.

Mr. Jones stated no, because right now the funding partners’ share is based on the minimum amount of Act 89. That is set by State. That has nothing to do with the Federal side of it at this point in time. Previously, CAT did ask for extra amounts for
capital projects, but they have been able to find other ways to fund those capital projects. There are some other State funds that could be used as the full 20% match. CAT has also been able to capitalize certain operating funds. They are able to use some of the fares paid by human services.

Mr. Hartwick asked how much is CAT’s advertising budget.

Mr. Philbin indicated that CAT is currently guaranteed a minimum of $70,000 in advertising revenue from Multi Media, which is an agency that services several transit authorities in central Pennsylvania. CAT is, however, on a course for a record year of $250,000. Last year it was in the vicinity of $100,000.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he understands that advertising is in different buckets, because CAT has some things that pay for right-of-ways that are in bus locations and then you have billboards on the sides of buses, but the total revenue for advertising is projected at $250,000.

Mr. Philbin indicated yes.

Mr. Hartwick stated that if it actually can be applied to the local share for Federal match that is a decision from a budgeting perspective for where to allocate those dollars.

Mr. Jones stated yes. At this time, CAT is finding other ways to meet that without even costing the locals anything at this point in time.

Mr. Saylor stated that the County Solicitors are saying that the advertising dollars can be counted towards the 15% match, so CAT may want to take another look at that.

Mr. Jones indicated that he will check into that. He wasn’t sure about the State funds.

Mr. Hartwick stated that if the County is meeting the minimum local match any dollars that would go towards meeting that obligation from the locals would be a direct reduction in the match amounts, if CAT made the budgetary decision to do so.

Mr. Haste stated and if nothing else it covers what you are calling shortfall.

Mr. Jones stated okay.

Mr. Haste stated the shortfall, if Cumberland does what they say they are going to do, it is his understanding that the City is at least willing to try to make up what is viewed as a shortfall and Cumberland, he believes, is thumbing their nose at it. He asked if that was his understanding.

Mr. Jones stated yes.

Mr. Hartwick stated and the City has not paid.
Mr. Haste indicated that the City hasn’t, but he believes they are willing to work out a plan.

Mr. Jones indicated that is what he has been led to believe, but he doesn’t want to speak for the Mayor.

Mr. Haste stated that if CAT doesn't get those pots of money he asked if CAT will be back to this Board to cover both of those folks.

Mr. Jones indicated that they will not.

Mr. Pries stated that he is an optimist. He sees the glass as half full in many areas. The labor agreement – the overall cost savings for the new labor agreement will be $147,470 per year.

Mr. Jones stated approximately.

Mr. Pries asked if the wages from July of 2013 through June of this year were a 1% increase, which was a cost savings of $82,000 and the projected cost savings from the wage increase from the new agreement was 2% from July 2014 through June 30, 2015 will be cost savings of $226,000.

Mr. Jones stated correct.

Mr. Young indicated that includes benefits.

Mr. Pries stated close to $250,000 in savings. The one area that he has some concerns about is when it was mentioned that the union had worked on the labor agreements in the past and that they earned a benefit not to come to work. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Jones stated for reasons that they could not show up for calling off. If you are sick or you have a family emergency. One of the terms is a miss. A lot of these terms go way back. A lot of these issues go back to when it was Harrisburg Railways. At one point in time the misses were in the twenties. CAT is down to nine.

Mr. Pries stated the misses are call-offs. They are similar, if you are sick and can’t come in. It is not just you don’t feel like showing up.

Mr. Jones stated no.

Mr. Pries asked Mr. Jones to explain to the Board, the call-off no show policy and procedure and how it negatively impacts the operation, as well as how does CAT operate daily on an operational basis when it gets a call-off.
Mr. Jones stated that if someone doesn’t show up for work for whatever reason, a lot of times it is legitimate, but someone else has to take that route. They can’t afford not to have that bus go. People count on them so CAT either has to pay someone to stick around and pay them overtime or use the “extra board”. They are a group of individuals who are sitting there. They come in staggered throughout the day in case someone misses their piece of work. If CAT can control these mark-offs, hopefully they will be able to reduce that amount of the extra board and save money on that time, but also by better use and not also have to use the overtime.

Mr. Pries asked if their numbers compare to other agency operations around the State.

Mr. Jones stated that he really doesn’t know those numbers.

Mr. Pries stated that for future labor negotiations he would hope that Mr. Jones would have that information handy to negotiate in the future.

Mr. Hartwick asked if the call-ins are in additional sick time and vacation time.

Mr. Jones stated that they may be part of that.

Mr. Hartwick asked if they are counted in as sick time and vacation time or there nine additional days for call-off beyond what they get for sick time and vacation time.

Mr. Jones stated that the nine amounts to if you come in late or if you don’t show up. It might be a sick time, but it is an unexpected absence.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he is sure in the negotiating contract that there are terms for how many hours you get for sick leave, vacation, etc. He asked if this was in addition to those hours.

Mr. Jones stated that they can run concurrently. Sometimes there may be sufficient time to cover that and sometimes there might not be. CAT’s sick time policy, you can only use it if you are sick. If the spouse or child would be sick they are not eligible. If they don’t have personal time, they might have to take it without pay.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the County runs 24/7 operations. The idea that there is an allotted amount of time that someone would receive for both sick and vacation is clearly defined in those contract terms. He asked what would be the hours for sick, vacation and is there an additional amount of time to have these call offs. This is important to have, because there has been a lot of talk about this.

Mr. Haste stated that if he calls off and uses one of his nine misses, because he had a flat tire that day, does that just count as one of his nine and that is a day that he gets off paid or when he comes in does he have to fill out a slip that says he is taking sick or personal leave. He asked if he has to take leave and that call off is just for disciplinary reasons. He gets nine breaks to call off on short term.
Mr. Jones stated that there is a difference between an occurrence and a miss. A miss is when they are late for work or something along those lines or if they would sleep in and not call in on time.

Mr. Haste stated so they eventually show up.

Mr. Jones stated that they may show up and they may not.

Mr. Pries stated that technically they don’t have to call in or show up.

Mr. Jones stated that at some point they do have to call in. If they don’t they can’t come back to work.

Mr. Pries stated that technically a miss could be if he woke up late and decided that he wasn’t coming in and then he is covered that day. He is covered nine times to make that decision during a calendar year. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Jones stated in theory yes, but if you don’t call in before noon you will not work the next day.

Mr. Pries asked how many sick days do the employees get.

Mr. Jones stated seven a year.

Mr. Pries asked how many vacation days.

Mr. Jones stated that it depends on seniority.

Mr. Pries asked how many personal days.

Mr. Jones stated four and then there is an additional one for safety, which would amount to five.

Mr. Pries stated in addition to what you can get normally with a sick day, vacation day, personal day, you also get misses. That is an interesting negotiation that has been accomplished in the past. He doesn’t know of too many places that you can just miss and get credit for it.

Mr. Jones stated that when he first came to CAT he about fell through the floor when he saw it. It was a benefit that was won across the negotiating table. He can’t change history. He can only change moving forward. The union is aware of what is going on. They are willing to work with them to make sure that these people show up.

Mr. Pries stated that you can miss from six misses in six months to nine in a year. The absenteeism in the new labor agreement occurrences were reduced from 14 to 12. If
someone can be absent 12 times, he asked how those numbers equal nine in a 12-month period. He asked if absenteeism is different than a miss.

Mr. Jones stated that it can be. A miss can be an occurrence. He can get an occurrence if he is supposed to be at work today and he calls in sick that is an occurrence. If he has to leave early that is an occurrence. They are not here to kick everybody out for having it, but what is a reasonable amount. The occurrence policy, the intention of that is to control the people who abuse the system.

Mr. Pries stated that absenteeism cut from 14 to 12 in 12 months, misses 9 in 12 months.

Mr. Jones stated that they could be together. They can be one in the same.

Mr. Pries asked if it could be 21.

Mr. Jones stated no.

Mr. Pries asked why.

Mr. Jones stated that if you would have a miss it could be an occurrence.

Mr. Pries stated that if you can have up to 9 misses and up to 12 absenteeisms then it is not really nine. It is up to potentially 12.

Mr. Jones stated that the misses aren’t considered more critical. You have less of those. If you have a miss you can also get an occurrence.

Mr. Pries asked what the difference in definition is between absenteeism and misses.

Mr. Young stated that another way to define a miss is that someone shows up for work late today. Somebody who is a minute late for work, they have a system set up with the report people that they are ready to take that vehicle out the minute someone is late. That would be a miss, just being late. Other things that are in the contract for a miss is if someone wakes up this morning and is not feeling well, they call in sick and if they don’t make that call one hour prior to the scheduled report time it is a miss. In that situation it is a miss plus they called in sick so they are going to get a sick leave occurrence at the same time. The occurrence piece of it is they are calling because they are not showing up. The way the policy was set with 12 people – realization people do get sick. You don’t want to penalize somebody for getting sick, but at what point is somebody just calling off to get extra days off.

Mr. Pries asked why is a miss maxed out at 9 days, but absenteeism is maxed out at 12. There is a three day difference there.
Mr. Young indicated that getting it down to 9 is good given the history and work towards getting it to a controllable level. At one point it was at 25.

Mr. Haste stated that as an example if he would come in 10 minutes late that is a miss. The bus has to go out so they took one of the on call drivers that are sitting there and send them out. Now he shows up 10 minutes late, he asked what he does then.

Mr. Young stated that if there is no work at that point they would go home and that is going to be both an occurrence and a miss.

Mr. Haste stated so at that point he does need to take leave or it is without pay.

Mr. Young stated correct.

Mr. Pries asked if the individual that is in doing that shift is he getting overtime.

Mr. Young stated that if they have the report person sitting there they go out on regular time.

Mr. Haste asked how many people are sitting there.

Mr. Young stated that it depends on the time of the day there are three to four. The people on the Board have been built off of what have been the trends in the past. They try to plan to make sure that every day, based off the trends, that they have someone available.

Mr. Pries stated that he had concerns with up to 12 days for absenteeism, but 9 for misses. He still doesn't understand the definition of absenteeism versus misses, but he will work that out in the future. Health insurance – it is showing a projected annual savings of $277,000 for the new labor agreement on an annual basis.

Mr. Haste asked if that is $277,000 in addition to the wages. It was mentioned earlier $290,000.

Mr. Young stated that with wages and benefits, the benefits are more than just the health insurance. That is lumped into all employee benefits that were paid. The $290,000 is all employee benefits.

Mr. Pries stated that is a positive.

Mr. Hartwick asked what kind of arrangement is CAT in, retro refund, perspective or fully self-insured. Retro refund is where you have a fixed amount over a course of time and then you settle up based upon utilization. A perspective arrangement that is fully insured and you get a three year contract that takes a look at what utilization is and then they negotiate a new contract based upon the utilization or a fully self-funded
arrangement that you only pay for what is actually used and then that is funded solely by the entity.

Mr. Jones stated a perspective.

Mr. Pries stated that if an individual is going to come in late under a miss and you have the individual that is in the pool that is going to take that route initially, the individual who is in that pool for a potential call-off, he asked if that is part of their weekly time or are they getting additional time to be the backup.

Mr. Young stated that it is part of their weekly time.

Mr. Pries asked how that is switched around and who gets to be the pool guy that potentially goes out or doesn’t go out.

Mr. Jones stated that about three times a year they adjust their service. The drivers, by seniority, pick what they are doing.

Mr. Haste stated so they can pick their route or whatever.

Mr. Jones stated that certain people will pick the extra board. In the summer they see some higher seniority people take the extra board, because they get all the good ones over the summer.

Mr. Pries indicated that he appreciates being CAT’s oversight. Mr. Jones and shown from last year to next year a cost savings and that is the first time in a while.

Mr. Jones stated that it has been a long time.

Mr. Pries stated that based upon the presentation today and the information that he has in front of him, he asked if CAT is telling the Board, honestly, that this current business model that is being used is it sustainable or unsustainable moving into the future.

Mr. Jones stated sustainable and that is why he mentioned the five year balanced budget. There are corrections that need to be made, but as they move forward they are making them as they go. There is still a lot more work to be done.

Mr. Haste stated that it is sustainable as long as the funding partners continue to increase their funding.

Mr. Jones stated yes. That is set by Act 89 that it has to go up 5% a year.

Mr. Haste stated until it reaches the 15%.
Mr. Jones stated that right now, the increases in State funding has been increasing at a higher rate than the 5%. If the Board looks at the local share of the State match, the total percentage is actually reduced. It will be a while until it gets to the 15%.

Mr. Haste indicated that it is all the more reason the advertising dollars would help.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he spoke at a Directors’ Meeting about the cadillac tax, the potential impact to taxpayers and what the County plans on doing. The County went through a long time period where there was a long term very clear cut plan on how the County is able to achieve moving from a horrible situation from the last board of commissioners in a retro refund arrangement where they paid for 90% of their healthcare and when this Board (at the time it was Commissioner Haste and Commissioner Hartwick) came into office there was about a $5 million call due, because the past Board didn’t change plan design and they didn’t affect utilization. The past Board didn’t talk about having a vested interest from individual employees into healthcare. It is a difficult discussion to have, because with the County’s line staff as well, they are not the highest paid employees. Part of coming to work for government is the opportunity to get benefits and the Board is doing everything it can to save costs. The Board moved from that retro refund arrangement to getting control of the utilization and making plan design changes into a fully self-funded plan, which has saved about $10 million over the last four years. So, having a plan and understanding what that plan is and how one needs to move and adjust to put into play, even though the County has made adjustments, it is going to have to unfortunately make deeper adjustments to avoid Federal tax consequences that are going to be very difficult to endure without those plan design changes. That is going to be placed on the backs of taxpayers. From a perspective of where CAT wants to go with healthcare to where it is at, CAT really needs to get a long term, long range management plan. A discussion was held regarding the call-offs versus the sick time and it was really hard for him to decipher. It is a different era now where folks need to understand that the County is taking a look at all those costs that can be controlled. CAT, like the County, is forced to deal with Federal and State budget issues that are going to be eventually passed down to local folks and local organizations. In order for the County to worry about those costs that it can control, they need to take a look at every aspect. He doesn’t believe the call-offs are potentially a good plan. He also understands that there are two separate pension funds for the administration of CAT as well. If CAT is going to talk about trying to make cuts and really make negotiations on behalf of the workers from a leadership perspective, it is good to address the things that are also out of line related to administrative benefits. He asked if Mr. Jones can explain the two pension plans.

Mr. Jones stated that there is the basic pension plan that he spoke about earlier for the front line and then years ago there is a small pension plan for several of the administrative employees.

Mr. Hartwick asked if the benefits are different.

Mr. Jones indicated yes.
Mr. Hartwick stated that CAT is talking about taking on, clearly the administrative costs, based upon other agencies, is not in line. He understands geographically the routes, funding partners, the Federal reimbursement structure all of those things play a big factor. From his perspective, when you take a look at what costs can be controlled, you want to think about how that can be embodied in order to go into negotiations with a clear set of plans that also includes the benefits that the administrative staff receive and take that leadership on and address those issues rather than having them be an impediment to negotiations, because he doesn’t believe either side is running as efficiently or effectively as it can based upon the reality of where they are at with costs. The structure of the City of Harrisburg’s financial crisis, the need for more services and the position that the County is in from taxpayers, everybody needs to rethink what the actual game plan is moving forward and how some of these benefits can be addressed that are out of line with what other taxpayers may be receiving, including what government employees may be receiving related to benefit packages, as well as compensation packages. You are not going to be able to have that kind of success unless some of these issues can be addressed that he keeps hearing about. He is hearing and he understands the union needs to make concessions, he understands that they are based upon some other models related to SEPTA, which the County sort of compares them to the local models in York, Lancaster and what the wage rates are and what is competitive in the market. If the union is being asked to move forward with those kinds of issues, you should also be taking a serious look at what benefits the management staff receive in order to set the tone for the appropriate level of negotiations in order to achieve real savings, which ultimately is going to help the funding partners to be able to meet the local obligations. CAT has one thing that he has heard about for 10 years that has been the subject of the multitude of major future expenses and inefficiencies and it is the inability to have a service area. It is out of date. CAT doesn’t have the ability to convert to natural gas due to all of the necessary repairs. That is a major issue. Talk about making an investment for things that could potentially provide future savings that has to be a focus of what CAT needs to do moving forward. He asked if they could let him know about what those plans are. If CAT is going to realize long term savings CAT needs to address those costs, the ability to control labor costs, the ability to look at management from a whole, but also take a look at future investments and what that means with potential savings.

Mr. Jones indicated that he agrees. He can tell from the management side that they also have to be able to attract and retain proper talent. On the management side, while the union has gotten numerous raises, management has been frozen. Management got one raise in four years. Management has taken a beating. He has to be able to maintain. If you compare the management salaries, both regionally and nationally, they are under. Management is under paid. This is one of the few options that he has to maintain a proper level. He can guarantee that every cost is looked at to see if there is a better way of doing it, but you also have to be reasonable. Management has gone over and above. They have gotten little to no raises for almost five years.
Mr. Hartwick stated that the operating expenses still continue to be outside of what other local area transits are incurring.

Mr. Jones stated that those numbers, when Toby Fauber was here, he talked about some of those operating numbers of administrative personnel.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that things are moving in the right direction. This is not an attack. The idea of moving in the right direction is happening, but based upon the constraints on the funding partners, the unavailable resources moving forward to just rely on one group to be able to fund that when the County is under significant constraints as well he thinks everything needs to be looked at. The Board was told that if they would have brought these issues up prior to this may be they would have been addressed before. He sat here for almost 11 years in budget processes, whether it was your predecessor or Mr. Jones, the Board has been bringing up these issues about internal looks at efficiency, management structure, the ability to try to address healthcare and manage the costs that can be controlled, he is glad that someone is finally paying attention and seeing some progress. There is a lot of work that can be done. The County is willing to be a partner with CAT in order to do that work. The message from the Board is just don’t rely on the funding partners to increase that level of additional funding from taxpayers. Let’s cooperatively work together in order to meet the obligations and the costs of the agencies and the ability to control future costs, but let’s have real conversations about it. The County would be glad to be partners.

He is the oversight of Human Services and he has heard a lot about concerns related to MATP. There were issues related to funding of MATP about two years ago until they went up against the Federal government and understanding that this is an entitlement program and the State, based upon their role and responsibility, is forced to fund MATP. It still doesn’t mean that the County should have inefficiencies out there and loss of revenue. Last calendar year there were about $63,000 that was part of the no shows related to MATP, which means that there has been some challenges related to getting folks to doctors’ appointments who qualify for medical assistance transportation. Mr. Eisenhauer of MH/ID also serves as the transportation liaison related to these matters. According to his correspondence with him, they have communicated to CAT about these challenges in billing throughout August, September and October. CAT notified MH/ID that they were not pursuing a rate increase to offset the costs and that they were not taking any actions at that time to recoup these funds. He would like to get an update and status - $63,000 is important to try to provide indirect services to people that help.

Mr. Young stated that the information the Board received from Mr. Eisenhauer is absolutely correct. CAT is starting to plan out a full increase. He wants to look at the reallocation of the zones and the way they have done everything in itself. With those no shows and there are several properties around the State that are looking at this the same way. He had a really hard time of just increasing the overall rates at this point. The seniors or people with disabilities, they are required to pay 15% of that trip cost straight out of their pocket. By increasing the rates to everybody to make up that $63,000, it is the seniors and people with disabilities that are going to end up paying.
He wants to take a look at 100% of the trip request. Get down to what is the average trip length. Right now, the lowest amount, the $15 trip is 0 to 3.9 miles. There are a lot of people that are taking 1 and 2 mile trips. He is looking to see if he can build a couple extra zones at this point and giving some of those people that are taking very short trips some break in cost, but those that are taking longer trips get a more appropriate rate. They are hoping by January or February, they will have an outlay of what CAT can do on its entire fare structure to not only be fair to the individuals using the service, but at the same time start recouping some of that money.

Mr. Hartwick stated that may not be the only option. For no shows CAT is allowed to place sanctions for their no show appointment. If they are going to be using the service and they don’t show there is the ability to place some level of sanctions. There are exemptions – dialysis patients, medical complications and individuals who have special circumstances as defined, but for folks outside of those areas that there are fees that can be assessed to those individuals who have arranged for a ride and have not shown.

Mr. Young stated that piece of it is all managed through Center for Community Building and the administrative piece between them and the County office. CAT does not get involved in that piece of the MATP Program with the no shows. One of the issues that he did present to Mr. Eisenhauer with the no shows is CAT’s no show policy for the programs that they administer directly is 3 no shows within a 30-day period is a suspension from service. Those programs that CAT manages the no show policy, there is about a 1.5% no show experience. With the MATP program there is about a 7 to 8% no show experience. Those no shows sanctions are managed through Center for Community Building.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it is worthy of a follow-up meeting and the ability to try to address this with the Center for Community Building, because the idea of that was to deploy the most efficient and effective form of transportation, not necessarily CAT, in cases of shorter trips to be able to allow folks to get to where they are at on time to these medical appointments. That was just CAT’s share of the contracted services for MATP. He needs to figure out how the County can get a process of sanctions for individuals who no show and who is going to be responsible for that assessment in order to make sure people who are eligible for the plan can continue to receive rides that are actually participating and showing up.

Mr. Young stated that one of the concepts that he floated in his conversations with Mr. Eisenhauer at this point is for the MATP people that are frequently not showing up for their rides that CAT has the ability to hold them accountable to CAT’s no show policy, which is stricter than what the MATP is. They would not be eligible for assignment for the trip through CAT, but CCB would have to arrange it through one of their other providers, which is more costly at that point, therefore, the MATP program will be bearing the cost of that and it won’t be everybody else that bears the cost of that. That option is being discussed right now.
Mr. Hartwick indicated that he will talk to Mr. Eisenhauer to see if that can’t be addressed in a follow-up. This is not an attack. When the Board talks about moving in the right direction, the editorial comments are “we are starting to move in the right direction”. There is a ways to go. Management and labor needs to get on board.

Mr. Young stated that the MATP program is a challenge for everyone.

**SALARY BOARD**

A complete set of Salary Board Meeting Minutes are on file in the Commissioners’ Office.

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

Ms. Lengle asked if there were any questions on the Personnel Packet. (There was none.)

> It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve the Personnel Packet as presented.

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.

**PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci indicated that all budget adjustments were made. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)

> It was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve the Purchase Order Packet as presented.

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.

**REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE DIRECTOR – MIKE YOHE**

Mr. Yohe presented the following Report:

> Report from the Office of Budget & Finance  
> November 19, 2014

- **November 7, 2014** transferred $1,073,613.76 to the Payables account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.

- **November 14, 2014** transferred $4,987,578.87 to the Payables account and $2,131,974.81 to the Payroll account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.
• Wire Payments since last report: $5,100,687.70

• Debt Service Payments since last report: $7,385,131.88

• Term Investments
  • 10/25/14 - $1,000,000.00 5-month CD – Centric Bank – 0.25% - matures 3/25/15

• Balance today in PA INVEST account #2100017144860: $1,380.58 rate 0.050%

• Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #10013172621: $2,704,286.56 rate 0.250%

• Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #1190002023: $1,068.80 rate 0.050%

• Balance today in First National Bank investment account #97014743: $9,581,260.48 rate 0.300%

• Balance today in Integrity Bank Money Market Checking account #2206001209: $22,296,050.39 rate 0.260%

• Balance today in Santander Bank investment account #9551017714: $15,031,127.54 rate 0.300%

• Balance today in Metro Bank investment account #539014068: $5,000,000.00 rate 0.350%


Mr. Yohe noted that budget hearings will resume tomorrow morning.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor stated that he has nothing to report unless there are questions of him. (There was none.)

SOLICITOR’S REPORT – JOSEPH A. CURCILLO, III, ESQ.

Mr. Curcillo indicated that he has nothing to add, all items are ready for your consideration. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

A. Purchase of Service Agreements between Dauphin County (Children & Youth) and:
2. Silver Springs-Martin Luther School, Inc.

B. Adoption Assistance Agreement #2014-49.

C. Amendment #1 to the Administrative Operating Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Human Services and the County of Dauphin.

D. Human Services Development Fund Agreement between Dauphin County and United Cerebral Palsy of Central Pennsylvania, Inc.

E. Service/Maintenance Agreement between Dauphin County and ESCO, Inc. for the annual inspection, testing of the entire system and quarterly inspections of the alarm system at the Recycling Center.

F. Satisfaction Piece for Megan Nazar on the property located at 159 Oaklea Road, Harrisburg, PA 17110 - $2,500.00.


J. Submission of a Request for Release of Funds and Certification to the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development for the Dauphin County Housing Authority’s Public Housing Capital Fund Program-Five Year Capital Improvement Program.

K. Listing Contract between Dauphin County and RSR Realtors for property at 1241 S. 28th Street, Swatara Township (Kitchen).

L. Lease Agreement between Dauphin County (Northern Dauphin Human Services Center) and De Lage Landen Financial Services, Inc. for a Lanier Digital Color Copy System (MPC4503) and a Digital Copy System (MP5002sp).

M. State and Local Government Master Operating Lease Agreement #103108, Schedule Number 103108000060 between Dauphin Count (IT) and Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company.


O. Training Packet.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve Items A through O, listed above under Matters Requiring Board Action.

Question: Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.
FORMER BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

COMMISSIONERS’ DISCUSSION & ACTIONS

There was none.

CORRESPONDENCE

The following correspondence was received in the Commissioners’ Office and will be handled by the staff appropriately.

A. Notification from Mellott Engineering, Inc. advising that Gregory W. Culbertson is applying to DEP for a NPDES Permit associated with the discharge of stormwater from the construction of a single family dwelling and associated infrastructure on Fishing Creek Valley Road in West Hanover Township.

B. Notification from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. advising that Royalton Borough is applying to DEP for a BWM-GP-5, 11 General Permit for Lower Ward Storm Sewer Upgrades along S.R. 441, as well as along Penn Street, Allen Street and Shippen Street.

C. Notification from R. J. Fisher & Associates, Inc. advising that Triple Crown is applying to DEP for a NPDES Permit for stormwater discharges associated with Phase 2 of the Ivy Ridge residential development along Orchard Drive in Swatara Township.

D. Notification from Hoover Engineering Services, Inc. advising that Bruce Myers is applying to DEP for a NPDES Permit for stormwater discharges associated with the development of a 64,800 square foot manufacturing facility on Port View Drive, Swatara Township.

E. Notification from Material Matters, Inc. advising that the Derry Township Municipal Authority is applying to DEP for the renewal of its existing NPDES Permit for the Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant in Londonderry Township.

F. Notification from BL Companies advising that UGI Utilities, Inc. is applying to DEP for a Utility Line Stream Crossing GP-5 Permit for the replacement of an existing 12” steel medium pressure distribution gas main with proposed 8” steel gas medium pressure gas main in the City of Harrisburg.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board adjourn; motion carried.

Transcribed by: Richie-Ann Martz