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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. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve the October 1, 2014 Workshop Meeting Minutes and the October 8, 2014 Legislative Meeting Minutes; motion carried.

It was moved by Ms. Rebuck and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve the October 8, 2014 Salary Board Meeting Minutes; motion carried.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the October 8, 2014 Election Board Meeting Minutes; motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor reported that there were no Executive Sessions held between meetings.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Toby Fauver, Deputy Secretary, PA Dept. of Transportation

1. Update on the South Central Pennsylvania Regionalization Study

Ms. Fauver stated that he is here today to talk about the status of the Transportation Consolidation Study effort. Prior to Act 44, there was a convoluted mess of transit funding from different years, with different match and program requirements. Much of the funding didn't grow. With Act 44, PennDOT was able to completely restructure transit funding and get most of the operating assistance, at the time, dedicated out of State sales tax. State operating assistance began to grow. Capital is a problem, because under Act 44 it was tied to the turnpike payments and Interstate 80 tolling,
which didn’t come to fruition. The intent of the program was to create a sustainable program, but have funding linked to need performance. They developed a transportation trust fund, which broke down into operating capital and then programs of statewide significance, which funds some of the smaller programs such as inter-city rail, persons with disabilities program and some of the other smaller programs that exist.

Mr. Haste asked if shared ride is included.

Mr. Fauver stated that the Capital portion of shared ride is funded out of that as well.

Mr. Hartwick asked about MATP.

Mr. Fauver stated that MATP is funded under the Department of Public Welfare. Many times it gets linked up with shared ride, because it uses the shared ride backbone. Many times people blame PennDOT for changes in the MATP program. The policies and programs run out of the Department of Public Welfare. The Transportation Operating Assistance in 2014/15 is $913 million. It was a base funding of $860 million. New funding that came out of Act 89 was $53 million. One of the pieces of operating assistance from Act 44 that didn’t work well was the payments from the Turnpike. That was fixed and did not grow. One of the changes that occurred in Act 89 is that money got swapped out for growing funding sources. All of State operating assistance is now from funding sources that can and will grow. State sales tax is the major one.

There is a formula for distribution of funding. Every system in the State competes with every other system. The formula and statistics is only for growth and funding. The amount of money that was received the year previous becomes a base for the following year. This creates stability in the program that people can count on at least getting the base if their statistics don’t really grow. There was a change in Act 89 to create that formula base. The formula is based upon passengers, senior passengers, revenue vehicle hours and revenue vehicle miles. Capital Area Transit, York, Lebanon, they all compete with SEPTA equally for that funding. In terms of local match for CAT, in 2007 and 2008 State operating assistance was $5.3 million. In 2014/15, State operating assistance is $7.4 million. Along with that there was a requirement that local match, in order to get to a minimum of 15% of the State share, which is the law today, had to grow by 5% over the previous year until it gets to 15% of the State share. In 2007/2008, CAT local match percentage was 10.6% of the State funding received. SEPTA, Port Authority and Fayette County are the only places in the State that currently are getting 15% of the State share. Everywhere else it is less than that, due to the mix of previous funding sources.

Mr. Pries asked why.

Mr. Fauver stated that it was because of the mix of previous funding sources. There was a mix of the old funding sources prior to Act 44. They had different match requirements. Some of it was 25% all the way down to 3 1/3%. Local government can enact waivers and say that they will not contribute any more. That largely has been
done away with and they went to an average of 15% local match. So, they reduced State operating assistance from 25% down to 15%, averaged out with the other sources and said everybody needs to get to 15%. When Act 44 was passed, because there was so much variability in the State, they knew it would be a huge burden on local government to say that they would have to go to 15% immediately to be equal, so the growth provision was included. Once you reach 15% then it is just 15% of the State share. In 2007/08, the growth in State funding has actually exceeded, in some cases or has been equal to the 5% growth. As a percentage of State operating assistance it is at 10.6% and in 2014/15 it is at 10.85%. It is a very slow growth process, because 5% of local funds of State funding grows at 6%, the local percentage goes down. If State funding grows at less than 5% then the local percentage goes up. Eventually over a long period of time, they projected close to 30 years, until everyone would be at 15%. 5% seems like a lot to local government, but State funding is now growing at a substantial rate and it is guaranteed. It is coming from dedicated sources.

Mr. Pries asked about the 30 year date, starting when.

Mr. Fauver indicated largely in 2007/2008. Every system is on a different trajectory depending on where someone started. CAT started with 10.6% average. Some systems were at 4 or 5%. If sales tax grows substantially it may take longer. In February of 2010, PennDOT requested letters of interest from transit authorities and counties that wanted to express interest in potentially looking to consolidate as a way to save money and make the systems sustainable. There were several entities that expressed interest in wanting to pilot things in 2010. Lackawanna and Luzerne County came in and expressed interest. They studied Lackawanna/Luzerne; they have five systems there, two shared ride systems and three fixed route systems. They studied that and then the counties ultimately decided to merge the shared ride systems with the fixed route systems, but haven't taken any steps to merge fixed route systems. They are starting to talk about merging fixed route with the airport authority and creating one transportation authority for the region.

In terms of transportation consolidation, York and Adams Counties recently merged after a long period of time where York was managing the Adams County shared ride. They have one board. When they merged, they reduced full-time staff by 1.5 positions. It was administrative and it was through attrition. The savings for that merger was $75,000 in administration. York is now managing the Northumberland shared ride system. Northumberland County Commissioners called PennDOT and said that they are cancelling all their shared ride service. They brought York in and York was willing to take it on and do it. When they merged with Northumberland, they saved immediately five full-time equivalent positions. Savings was about $250,000 a year just in administration. The service remains the same or in some cases has improved. They also do joint procurements, which estimated savings was $100,000. They have been able to extend useful life in some of the counties that didn't have really good maintenance programs. They were able to implement York maintenance programs. They extended call center hours for reservations in some of those counties where they use to stop at 4:00 they extended it later, because the York Call Center is running.
They have been able to improve technology and communication equipment. The improved productivity in shared ride over that time went from 1.7 passengers per hour to 2.6. That is a huge increase in productivity in shared ride, which lowers overall costs for shared ride per passenger and gains more revenue to the entity, which helped the counties. Northumberland County was contributing general fund money to balance their shared ride budget. They no longer have to do that. It is sustaining itself.

In SouthCentral Pennsylvania, they started with a consolidation study that looked at Adams, Berks, Cumberland, Dauphin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York. There was a phase 1 study preliminary analysis done just with administration, which was completed in September 2012. A presentation was made to the Board at that time. The estimated savings, just on administration only, was estimated at $4.6 million annually. Since then everybody considered whether they were interested in moving on with the Phase 2 study or not. The gentleman that ran the Reading System passed away and they called Mr. Fauver and asked him to meet with the folks about what they should do next. Mr. Fauver suggested that the man running the Lancaster system could be contracted to run the system in Reading. They ran on a contract basis all spring and into the summer. The Boards recently voted to merge the systems together. The estimated savings is $750,000 to $800,000 per year. One of the things that exists in Act 89, the State built in an incentive for local government to consider consolidation, where it makes sense. That incentive provides a $1 for $1 reduction in local match if you get real savings as a result of consolidation or mutual cooperation. Mutual cooperation is you may not go fully to a merger, but you may see opportunities to save money by working together on things. In the case of Lancaster and Berks, if the merger is completed their local match would be reduced to zero for both of those counties for the next five years.

Mr. Pries asked would their estimated savings then go up higher than the $750,000.

Mr. Fauver stated that their local match is currently $750,000 for both systems. Their savings, dollar for dollar, will wipe out their local match requirement from the initial savings. Their savings are expected to grow.

Mr. Pries asked if the estimated savings of $750,000 includes the Act 89 local match.

Mr. Fauver stated that will be the local match. The other thing that they are projecting to do is actually expand service in both Lancaster and in Berks County as a result of other service savings they are expecting to see as a result of the merger. They are looking to deploy additional hours of service. In Berks County they currently don’t have Sunday service, but now they are going to have Sunday service.

PennDOT wants to continue pursuing the Phase 2 study for SouthCentral Pennsylvania. Because Berks and Lancaster are currently in the process of merging their systems together, they have asked not to be included in that phase. They want to focus on trying to get their consolidation in place. Since the first Phase of study has come out,
Franklin County has expressed interest in participating in the consolidation, mutual cooperation study that is currently being done.

Mr. Haste wanted to clarify if Berks and Lancaster said they didn’t want to be included.

Mr. Fauver stated that they want to focus on their own consolidation. They didn’t want to participate in this current Phase 2 study.

Mr. Haste asked who said they didn’t want to participate, the transit or the board of commissioners.

Mr. Fauver stated both.

Mr. Haste indicated that he had a conversation with Lancaster and his impression was that they would be willing.

Mr. Fauver stated that he will follow up with Lancaster County.

Mr. Haste stated that maybe they just want to wait a little bit. He doesn’t think it is off the table.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he doesn’t think so either. Their challenge is that they are going through a lot of change and they want to focus on that. They are looking to brand their authority as the SouthCentral Transit Authority so that neither county’s name is in it. They are looking on how they are going to focus their headquarters. Both maintenance facilities get maintained, the drivers still report, it doesn’t really affect operations other than saving money so they can put more service out. The drivers still report to the same places and they are still going to have the same dispatch managers. It is really the higher level of management where consolidation is taking place.

PennDOT has been in the process of collecting and analyzing data on finance, organization, governance, technology, fares and local funding. They are looking to work toward a final financial analysis, a proposed transition plan and implementation requirements for the consolidation option and on the other option, which is shared services, they are going to do the same type of analysis, but there wouldn’t necessarily be a transition plan for shared services. It would be focused on specific things.

Mr. Haste asked if something like that would still see a $1 for $1 savings.

Mr. Fauver indicated that it would. The results of this study will end up with two alternatives. One is full consolidation and what the benefits would be. The other is where are the opportunities for potentially shared services, what decisions need to be made and what structure needs to be put into place to achieve savings. They are looking to see if the County is interested in pursuing this effort.

Mr. Haste stated that he believes they are.
Mr. Pries stated that since Lancaster and Berks are opting out for Phase 2, he asked if he allows the representatives of CAT to be fully part of this process.

Mr. Fauver indicated yes.

Mr. Pries stated that he wanted to make sure that they have the opportunity to provide information and get details.

Mr. Fauver stated that it is geared around having a technical committee, which CAT is part of, as well as the other county shared ride departments. Lebanon Transit and York Transit are part of it. Anyone can participate. There are some commissioners that participate. PennDOT wants to focus on achieving results that benefit the residents and the local match participants and the riders of the service here.

Mr. Pries stated that when the County looks at regional approaches now and in the future, obviously the cost savings is something that stands out, however, the County wants to make sure that it maintains the high level of service that is currently provided and not have that negatively impacted.

Mr. Fauver stated that the first phase looked at administration. This phase is looking more at service.

Mr. Pries stated that he has seen some numbers on administrative costs, number of employees, etc. He asked if it was fair to compare CAT, Rabbit, Red Rose and other Central Pennsylvania transit groups.

Mr. Fauver indicated that they do operate differently, but they are providing the same type of operation. You need to make sure you are comparing apples to apples. You need to make sure you understand the data really well. There is good data reporting into the National Transit Database, which is probably some of the data that the Board has seen. It is consistent in the way it is collected.

Mr. Pries stated by the time it is received it is already two years old.

Mr. Fauver stated that from the first phase of study, PennDOT did identify that there are significant administrative savings across the Board. The positions that PennDOT would propose to go would be the ones that become vacant, not laying anyone off or looking to get rid of any employees. It may take a few years to achieve full savings. In the case of Lancaster and Berks, they had some vacant positions that they did not fill.

Mr. Pries stated that in terms of looking at the National figures that are provided, is there an agency with 22 employees and one with 8 and another one with 8 and 4 that are similar in size, he asked if that was a fair analysis.
Mr. Fauver stated that it could be fair and it may not be fair. He would have to sit down and look at the data to make sure.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the Board uses the Lancaster and Berks model as an example. When you talk about population size, Lancaster has about 550,000 residents and Berks is about 350,000. You take the combined total of the residents that are in that area, from a full-time staff's perspective, according to the 2012 survey between the Berks County and Red Rose Transit, there were a total of 14 administrative staff and based upon the population size of CAT is extraordinarily different. He heard some data about some administrative staff and the reduction of three since this report. Even if you take it at 18, CAT is still four more than the combination of those two counties. PennDOT is saying that as a result of that merger and the reduction of administrative staff, they still will be able to manage that same coverage area.

Mr. Fauver indicated that is true.

Mr. Hartwick stated from that perspective he asked how that is not comparing apples to apples when you take a look at coverage size, the number of folks that are served, the number of folks that exceed the amount of service area that is currently covered by CAT and you are going to see administrative savings and a reduction of staff even beyond where they are currently at. He asked Mr. Fauver if he had an idea of what administrative staff size may be as a result of the Lancaster and Berks system.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he did see the presentation earlier this week, but does not remember the numbers off the top of his head. It was four or five positions being reduced immediately, because they were vacant.

Mr. Hartwick stated so they may be able to run a service area close to a 1 million people with eight to nine administrative staff.

Mr. Fauver stated that where the numbers get a little funny is how the agencies classify administrative staff. There may be people that Lancaster and Berks classify as operating people, like dispatchers that another system could count as administrative staff. There could be a little bit of overlap. That is where the numbers get a little fuzzy.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the incentives for consideration of a merger, when you take a look at the cash operating assistance, which requires a local match of 15%, in order for the County to reduce its local match CAT would have to reduce their operating expenses in order for the County to be in line with the actual service area.

Mr. Fauver indicated that was correct.

Mr. Hartwick stated as they have higher operating expenses that also increases the level of State assistance.
Mr. Fauver indicated no. Operating expenses don’t increase the level of State assistance. Ridership, vehicle miles and vehicle hours increase operating assistance.

Mr. Haste asked if operational costs go into the base.

Mr. Fauver indicated no. The way base got established is historic State funding levels, not operational costs.

Mr. Hartwick stated that sometimes figuring out how that was quantified and the rationale behind those state formulas don’t equate to service and level of need.

Mr. Fauver indicated that is true. That is one of the things that PennDOT wanted to correct when they developed the formula for Act 44. In the past, some of the legislation was negotiated percentages. They were hard and fixed percentages. He does not know how they were established, because it was prior to him. In other cases there were some limited formula statistics that went into it. There is a benefit to a region that can save administrative money and lower operating expenses and maintain service and/or expand service. If you are able to save money and expand services and can put that money back into service you can gain even more state funding out of the formula. There is an incentive in the formula to provide more and better service and drive ridership up.

Mr. Hartwick stated and reduce local share.

Mr. Fauver stated that reduced local share is one of the incentives that they did not have before, but now exists. He heard loud and clear from the counties, they want to know what is in it for them. The money gets saved, CAT keeps the money, but what is in it for the counties and taxpayers. They were able to get that incentive built in. The legislature saw fit to put that in there. There is a financial incentive for local government.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it is also important to try to take a look at the individual end user/rider and ensuring that the County figures out a way to increase the level of service as well.

Mr. Fauver stated that more common technology across the region is a good thing. If people can use the same fare media and move interchangeably between systems in a region that is a good thing. That could be a mutual cooperation thing that gets done as well. There is a lot of opportunity for things to change to improve the service to riders and make it more seamless than what it is today. That can be done regardless of consolidation. If you can save money then you can put that savings back in to more service.

Mr. Hartwick stated there is a major incentive and an opportunity to expand services and reduce operating expenses and also address the local match concerns that continue to increase as it relates to budget requests to the counties.
Mr. Fauver stated that it is a big challenge in every county that has transit. He thinks that it is a big deal. They need to make sure that not only are they putting more State money into it that is growing and people can count on from year to year and plan for it, but the money should also be spent as wisely as possible.

Mr. Haste stated that when Mr. Fauver was talking about the study, when it was brought back to Dauphin County, the Board was going to see a savings of about $4.5 million. Most of that comes through attrition. That is a lot of folks for $4.5 million. There has to be something else.

Mr. Fauver stated that the numbers went from 173 administrative employees down to 122. There is a substantial reduction in administrative employees, if it was the whole region.

Mr. Haste stated that it is a lot of attrition.

Mr. Fauver indicated that there are a lot of vacancies out there.

Mr. Haste stated that in looking at the formula, trying to compare apples to apples, the Shippensburg route has become a popular route for CAT. When you look at the formula that, he thinks, would drive up revenue vehicle hours and miles, which is 65% of the formula. He asked if that would skew the numbers. York appears to be a lot more efficient than Dauphin County, but he doesn’t know if York has a Shippensburg route.

Mr. Fauver indicated that they have two runs. One that goes from Gettysburg to Harrisburg and one that goes from York to Harrisburg. It was a challenge getting a formula that would work across the state. There is a mix of commuter services, some of these longer distance services and then local more compact services. If you wanted to award high ridership and not service, you would focus primarily on ridership and then State College and SEPTA would get most of the funding. PennDOT had to find a balance between having a service component that becomes a base and then having a ridership portion. This formula that was arrived at works for everybody.

Mr. Hartwick stated that also a regional approach could take a look at ridership area and be able to dispatch and try to have a much better planning perspective as it relates to trips and how that high time ridership can most efficiently be delivered.

Mr. Fauver indicated that when Act 89 went through they did some runs and tried to look at the formula again to see if there were any tweaks that needed to be made to the formula. The legislature would need to make the adjustments. This works for the whole State.

Mr. Haste asked how fair is it when you see a report that says the County’s cost per capita is $2.57 and then the next closest is $1.02 and the cheapest is $.50.
Mr. Fauver stated that some of it is actual cost. If you look at cost per hour you can see that costs may be higher. Costs vary across the State. It is based on wages and expenses. CAT has some high costs due to the maintenance facility it has. There are a lot of things that go into the cost portion. A lot of it is just the cost. Fuel prices are the same. The biggest cost for transit other than fuel is probably labor.

Mr. Haste asked if he could explain the maintenance comment.

Mr. Fauver stated that the CAT Board knows that the maintenance facility is really antiquated and it is not efficient. You can’t store all the vehicles in it. It is not energy efficient. It is not in a place to be compliant with compressed natural gas (CNG). There really needs to be a focus on trying to get a maintenance facility improvement in some way, shape or form and storage to meet the needs of CAT now and into the future.

Mr. Haste asked whatever happened to District 8 and CAT on trying to do the natural gas.

Mr. Fauver stated that PennDOT’s challenge with natural gas, all the trucks that PennDOT runs around don’t come back to a central place for fueling. The trucks are fueled at different places, anywhere they need to stop to get fuel. They use a card. There is a fairly high operating cost if they had to return to a central fueling place. CNG for the PennDOT fleet is going to take some time. CNG stations need to be spread out within a region. PennDOT has a separate project that they are working on to do a P3 project for CNG stations at all the transit agencies. They had an industry forum yesterday where over 200 people attended. A lot of CNG companies are interested and it will provide both CNG fueling stations inside the fence for the transit agency, as well as outside the fence for the general public and for companies that might want to convert to CNG.

Mr. Haste asked when.

Mr. Fauver indicated that the advertisement for the RFQ should be out November 7th. The RFP would follow not too long behind that. They are anticipating that a vendor will be selected by May.

Mr. Haste asked where those systems will kick off.

Mr. Fauver indicated that there are a handful of systems that have CNG today. Probably one of the first ones to be upgraded will be State College. Johnstown has a brand new maintenance facility that is ready for CNG. They have a CNG bus ordered that will be delivered in the spring. Erie and Indiana will be upgraded. There are one or two others that have CNG compliant facilities that will be able to be implemented immediately. PennDOT’s intent is to invest in maintenance facilities so they can get people ready and every system in the State that wants to be included is included. The only one that doesn’t have interest right now is Philadelphia; even the Port Authority of Allegheny wants to be included.
Mr. Haste asked if PennDOT has seen or talked to a company that is trying to do mobile CNG. Instead of you taking your fleet somewhere, they bring it there. They need downtime.

Mr. Fauver indicated that PennDOT has talked to a lot of companies. They did talk to some of the mobile ones. Some of the mobile ones are actually looking at doing mobile maintenance/ sort of pop-up maintenance and storage facilities so that you didn’t have to do a major upgrade to a maintenance facility or storage. There are a couple of companies that have package stations that do both CNG and liquefied natural gas out of the same station, which some of the long haul trucking is interested in liquefied natural gas. They are going to be looking for partners when this transit CNG project happens with 37 sites. One will be in Harrisburg. When the sites are implemented they are going to be looking for partners to be part of that. The beauty of CNG for someone like CAT is that diesel fuel that they may be buying at $3.00 a gallon today, CNG is being bought for $1.20. They would be eligible to get a Federal tax rebate. In the case of State College, they are getting their CNG at about $.70 a gallon, once you take off the Federal tax rebate. It is a substantial savings in operating budgets that everyone will be able to take advantage of.

Mr. Pries asked what the cost is per vehicle to retrofit for CNG.

Mr. Fauver stated that it doesn’t make a lot of sense to retrofit vehicles. There is a plan that as vehicles come up for replacement they are able to replace them with CNG. It requires a much different engine. It is a structural difference in the body of the bus.

Mr. Pries indicated that there was a State grant two years ago providing funding for retrofitting. The cost of a new bus is substantial.

Mr. Fauver indicated it is $500,000. It is actually a little less than a hybrid bus. Hybrid buses are in the same ballpark to save fuel. Generally they are getting 16 years out of a bus.

Mr. Saylor stated that PennDOT is going to conduct this specific study. He asked if PennDOT needs anything from the County in terms of the cost.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he doesn’t.

Mr. Saylor asked how long it will take to complete the study.

Mr. Fauver indicated that PennDOT is projecting about six months to get the first draft of Phase 2. That would be shared with the technical committee.

Mr. Saylor stated that what the County will expect to see back from PennDOT are two options. One option will show Lebanon, CAT and York as three separate entities, but
sharing specific services. The second option would show Lebanon, CAT and York combining as one agency with one director and one operation.

Mr. Fauver indicated that is correct except for PennDOT is including Perry County shared ride and Franklin County shared ride in that.

Mr. Saylor stated that if you look at the local match section of PennDOT, the 2013/14, under state law, minimum match is $766,000. Last year CAT asked for over $1 million in local match and the funding partners (Cumberland, Dauphin and the City of Harrisburg) approved over $1 million in local match. This is over and above the $800,000 that is required. That has repeated itself going back to 2007/2008 to a tune of about $300,000 more than required by State law each and every year for a total of about $2 million in monies that were provided to CAT over and above what is required by the State. The County is still going over previous budget requests. He is sure that there are reasons for these additional dollars. This is the crux of the issue that they are looking at as they come into the budget hearings.

Mr. Hartwick asked if PennDOT has received a plan from CAT related to CNG.

Mr. Fauver indicated that PennDOT is working with CAT right now on the maintenance facility. There was an unsolicited proposal for a new maintenance facility for CAT. They don’t have Federal funding access to achieve that large project due to a lack of Federal funds. PennDOT is going to provide technical assistance to CAT to come up with a site location study and what is the best phasing opportunity for them to be able to afford to build a new facility and CNG would be part of that. They are going to try to work with CAT to extend existing life of buses for as long as they can so that when they are replaced they can be CNG, as opposed to replacing stuff that will have to be here for 12 years on diesel.

**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.

Mr. Hartwick indicated that he would like to Pull #17 so he can get additional information and an explanation. He needs to understand the rationale and what occurred prior to making any kind of change on the Personnel Packet.

> It was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Personnel Packet be approved, noting that Item #17 is pulled for further review.
**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.

**PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci stated that the Purchase Order Packet is the same as last week, with the exception of the budget adjustments that were corrected.

*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 – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR**

Mr. Yohe presented the following Report:

**Report from the Office of Budget & Finance**

**October 22, 2014**

- **October 10, 2014** transferred $2,112,335.52 to the Payables account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.

- **October 17, 2014** transferred $5,606,720.06 to the Payables account and $1,876,216.59 to the Payroll account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.

- Wire Payments since last report: $11,586,358.07

- Debt Service Payments since last report: $0.00

- Term Investments
  - 3/25/14 - $5,000,000.00 7-month CD – Centric Bank – 0.77% - matures 10/25/14

- Balance today in PA INVEST account #2100017144860: $1,380.52 rate 0.050%

- Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #10013172621: $12,601,016.78 rate 0.250%

- Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #119002023: $1,068.76 rate 0.050%

- Balance today in First National Bank investment account #97014743: $9,578,819.85 rate 0.300%
• Balance today in Integrity Bank Money Market Checking account #2206001209: $29,388,770.02 rate 0.260%

• Balance today in Santander Bank investment account #9551017714: $15,027,298.67 rate 0.300%


Mr. Yohe noted that a CD is coming due this week. He is going to roll that over.

Mr. Pries asked if it will stay at .77%.

Mr. Yohe indicated probably not.

Mr. Haste asked if he is up to date on all the budgets.

Mr. Yohe indicated yes. The schedule went out. The hearings will be held in a couple of weeks.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

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

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

Mr. Curcillo reported that everything is ready for the Board’s consideration. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)

MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

A. Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County (Children & Youth) and:
   1. Children’s Service Center of Wyoming Valley, Inc.
   2. The Impact Project, Inc.
   3. Pinkney’s Vineyard of Faith Ministries, Inc.
   4. United Children’s Home, Inc.
   5. United Methodist Home for Children Residential Care, Inc.
   6. Knowledge Learning Corporation

B. Adoption Assistance Agreements #2014-39 and #2014-47.

C. Amendments to Purchase of Service Agreements between Dauphin County (MH/ID) and:
   1. Community Services Group, Inc. – Amendment #1
   2. Keon Enterprises, LLC – Amendment #1
   3. Keystone Service Systems, Inc. – Amendment #1
   4. Patch-n-Match, Inc. – Amendment #1
   5. United Cerebral Palsy of Central Pennsylvania, Inc. – Amendment #1
   6. Christian Churches United of the Tri-County Area – Amendment #1
7. Express Scripts, Inc. – Amendment #3

D. Amendment #1 to Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County and JusticeWorks YouthCare, Inc.

E. Amended and Restated Sublease Agreement between Dauphin County and CMU, Inc.

F. Proposal from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. to provide a feasibility study for the Wildwood Lake Restoration Project.

G. Resolution #28 - 2014 authorizing the execution of a Bridge Inventory and Inspection Activity Reimbursement Agreement between Dauphin County and the PA Department of Transportation.

H. Volunteer Trail Stewardship Agreement between Dauphin County (Parks & Recreation) and Susquehanna Area Mountain Bike Association.

I. Confidentiality Agreement between Dauphin County (EMA) and PI Telecom Infrastructure, LLC.

J. Repository Bids received from Richard Holzer/New Heights South LLC for the following properties:

1. Parcel #02-013-031 (1318 Kittatinny St.) - $500.00
2. Parcel #02-013-048 (245 S. 13th St.) - $500.00
3. Parcel #02-016-007 (312 Crescent St.) - $500.00
4. Parcel #02-018-034 (331 Nectarine St.) - $500.00
5. Parcel #02-030-038 (1435 Swatara St.) - $500.00
6. Parcel #07-021-027 (1625 N. 6th St.) - $500.00
7. Parcel #09-012-011 (1212 Bailey St.) - $500.00
8. Parcel #09-012-012 (1214 Bailey St.) - $500.00

K. Repository Bids received from Jermaine Grant for the following properties:

1. Parcel #10-054-037 (2218 Susquehanna St.) - $500.00
2. Parcel #10-054-038 (2206 Susquehanna St.) - $500.00
3. Parcel #10-55-027 (2148 Susquehanna St.) - $600.00

L. Repository Bid received from Kristie M. Stoute – Parcel #08-015-011 (524 N. 16th St.) - $525.00.

M. Repository Bids received from Quisqueya Reynoso for the following properties:

1. Parcel #02-027-053 (428 Nectarine St.) - $500.00
2. Parcel #07-009-018 (624 Dauphin St.) - $500.00
3. Parcel #07-009-020 (620 Dauphin St.) - $500.00
4. Parcel #09-012-005 (1202 Bailey St.) - $500.00
5. Parcel #09-024-050 (1602 Regina St.) - $500.00
6. Parcel #10-021-012 (2640 N. 6th St.) - $500.00
7. Parcel #10-030-008 (2456 Reel St.) - $500.00

N. Renewal Contract between Dauphin County and United Concordia for the period January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

O. Settlement of Workers Comp Claim – William Balthaser - $135,000.
P. Renewal Contract between Dauphin County and Dearborn National for the period January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

Q. Budget Amendments for the quarter ending September 30, 2014.

R. Cooperation Agreement between Dauphin County and The Gamut Theatre Group.

S. Personal Services Agreement between Dauphin County and the YWCA Greater Harrisburg for the release of funds through the STOP Grant.

T. Ordinance #3-2014 authorizing the County to incur nonelectoral debt in the maximum principal amount of $7,034,518, to be evidenced by the County’s Liquid Fuels Revenue Note, Series of 2014-1 (Dauphin County Infrastructure Bank), in order to provide funding for transportation related improvements in the County.

U. Training Packet.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve Items A through U, 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

Mr. Haste noted that there will be a Retirement Board Meeting upon adjournment of the Commissioners’ Meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

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

A. Notification received from GHD advising that the Lower Paxton Township Authority is applying to DEP for a GP 8 and GP 11 Permit for the PC-4E Sanitary Sewer Replacement – Crum’s Lane.

B. Notification from Evans Engineering, Inc. advising that NOVO Real Estate Partners, LLC is applying to DEP for a NPDES Permit for stormwater discharges associated with the construction of an 11,200 square foot commercial building at 128 N. Hershey Rd., Harrisburg.
C. Notification from Capital Region advising that they are applying to DEP for the renewal of their Water Allocation Permit for the Dehart Dam and Susquehanna River locations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. John Keller is from the Capital Area Transit. He asked if the Board would consider, with all the talk about the consolidation, the fact that there are two different unions involved. One is Teamsters and the other is Amalgamated Transit. Unlike Berks and Lancaster, they are both Amalgamated Transit, so that was an easy transition. This would not be an easy transition.

Mr. Pries asked how many employees is the breakdown.

Mr. Keller indicated that CAT has close to 180.

Mr. Pries thanked him and his fellow operators for the service that they provide.

Mr. Haste asked who has York County.

Mr. Keller indicated that York is Teamsters and Harrisburg is Amalgamated.

Mr. Haste asked what Lebanon is.

Mr. Keller indicated Amalgamated. A majority of the transit agencies in this area are Amalgamated.

Mr. Hartwick stated that York is Teamsters.

Mr. Haste asked what is Lancaster and Berks.

Mr. Keller indicated Amalgamated.

Mr. Haste indicated that the majority of them are Amalgamated. To join the others wouldn’t be the issue. The issue is York.

Mr. Keller stated that it is his understanding from the President of Lancaster that both unions stayed intact. The wages stayed the same. They are both working under their separate contracts that they negotiated. He can’t see that happening if York would merge with CAT.

Mr. Hartwick asked Mr. Saylor to take a look at the York contract versus Amalgamated.

Mr. Saylor indicated that he believes that was to be part of the study.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the County needs to ensure that it has consideration for that as it moves forward.
Mr. Pries stated that is a good question, because when we talked about police regionalization one of the major issues that would be coming down the pike obviously is the same kind of issue, the unions and things like that.

Mr. Haste stated that a question came up, particularly with York being a different union than the other counties. He asked if that was part of the study.

Mr. Fauver stated that there are a couple of things. On the Federal side each one of the systems are covered under Federal 13C requirements. 13C still applies. Generally, they will look at a merger like this and you will have two operating units, because you have two different locals here. They have different rules and different work agreements. Those work agreements would be maintained separately. Over time they would have to work within those work agreements to determine what opportunities there may be for them to become more similar or where potentially efficiencies can be gained. They will also look to share the best practices out of each between them. There are a lot of examples out there where systems have been consolidated in the past and they have had separate unions and those unions have been maintained separately going forward. SEPTA is a big example of that where there are 13. It is a challenge, but it is no bigger a challenge than managing them separately.

Mr. Hartwick asked if there is representation from those unions as a part of the conversation on consolidation efforts.

Mr. Fauver stated that so far they have not involved the unions and generally they won’t do that. That is not a role that they play. It is largely up to the individual systems to bring those concerns back through their steering committee participants.

Mr. Haste asked if they do look at the effectiveness.

Mr. Fauver indicated that they do.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it would be great to have those concerns be a part of that.

Mr. Fauver indicated that they will make sure any concerns like that are addressed. Without working out the labor issues, something like this can’t happen. Those are critical elements that have to be sorted out. Anytime you talk about a change like this, people immediately go to here is what this may mean, the worst case scenario. Everybody worries about losing their job. From a practical point of view, this consolidation effort is largely focused on administration and then if there are savings from administration it should or could result in either service being stabilized in the future or even more service out there.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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