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MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m.
MOMENT OF SILENCE

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There are several sets of Meeting Minutes that will be considered at next week’s Legislative Meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS

Mr. Saylor reported that there was one Executive Session held this morning, April 29, 2015, to discuss litigation and personnel matters.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Toby Fauver, PA Dept. of Transportation

1. PennDOT Regional Transportation Study Update

Mr. Fauver indicated that he has been before the Board a few times to talk about consolidation. Recently, the consultants completed the Phase 2 Consolidation Report for Southcentral Transit. The report was reviewed with the stakeholders that were identified to participate in the committee. They asked all the stakeholders for comments on the report so that they could be addressed. He provided the following highlights from the report and will also talk about what the proposed next steps would be assuming that there is any interest in moving beyond this phase of work.

The Executive Summary shows the topics that were covered in the report. The analysis broke the study down into two components. One was to consolidate into a Single Regional Authority and the second was Share Services between the authorities. The executive directors from the authorities work with the consultants on identifying areas that could be shared and then the consultants worked on identifying how they thought that could best be accommodated. The areas that are addressed in the report are everything from legal entity, proposals on governance, transportation delivery, facilities, maintenance, call centers, fare structure, impacts on employees and potential for transition and transition costs and savings.

Mr. Haste stated on a financial impact, does it say that it saves money under the Single Authority, but costs money in Shared.

Mr. Fauver indicated yes and he will explain that.
On the background, in-between the Phase I study and as the Phase 2 Study was getting started, there was a decision made between Berks Authority and the Lancaster Authority to consolidate. Part of that consolidation decision was geared around the incentive that was provided under Act 89 to local governments. He heard from Dauphin County, as well as other local governments that it is great to get the savings and it is great that the savings would stay with an authority, but how does that savings benefit taxpayers. They built into Act 89 savings for the taxpayers. He will explain that a little bit later on. Berks and Lancaster moved forward and they estimated that their savings would be roughly $800,000. They achieved that and more. Their local match, between those two counties, is now zero for the next five years on operating.

Study Scope – This shows the major areas that were covered in the study. They reviewed the transit environment, looked at both Shared Services and Single Authority, estimated administrative cost savings by consolidating and they tried to estimate savings or costs associated with shared services. The consultants proposed what they believed was an ideal governing structure. It will take work to figure out how that would work within the region. There are other things that the consultants come out and say from their professional opinion what their recommendations are and if there is a decision made to move forward, one of the next steps is to get the local government entities together to talk about some of those key issues and how they work those issues out.

The Operating Profile – The services in this region, they studied about 5.2 million annual passenger trips, operating expenses of about $43 million, revenue coming in from fare and other revenues of about $20 million. Total vehicles is almost 376, with about half of that are fixed route big buses.

Some of the key assumptions in Single Regional Authority versus Shared Services Entity – no changes in service. In the Single Regional Authority they built in three year fare integration, but for Shared Services they didn’t figure in fare integration. Fare structure revenue is neutral. All union agreements, as they are today, would transfer over. The locals would transfer over. Instead of being managed by individual authorities from a management point of view, they would be managed by a consolidated authority from a management point of view.

Mr. Hartwick asked if that would be the case under the Single Regional Authority or the Shared Services Entity.

Mr. Fauver stated that on the Single Regional Authority that would be the case. Under Shared Services, the individual authorities retain their agreements and continue to do their own thing.

Mr. Hartwick stated that there would be a single management structure versus a multi-management structure as it stands currently under the Shared Services.
Mr. Fauver stated that under Shared Services, it would retain individual authorities with individual management. They would each still have their own individual grants that they would get. They would have their own individual management and decision-making with boards. Where the sharing comes in is if they looked at all the things that they propose sharing on such as IT services, fuel and other things, that you would need an entity to coordinate and management that sharing of services. That was the consultant’s opinion. It is Mr. Fauver’s opinion that if you picked off one or two of those things and you wanted to work between authorities you could try on one or two of those things to make them work. The difficult part is that if your goals are on IT and had two executive directors and the boards can agree on IT and you hire one person to do IT who does that person report to, where does that person get priority and how does that work. That can work if everyone is getting along. The hard part is if one authority says that they are going to go in a different direction on IT and now they need more time and someone else needs focus that raises a concern that the consultant had. They suggested that if a lot of services are going to be shared you would need an entity to manage that.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it sounds like the Shared Services part adds some additional burden, even more challenges in order to try to get there versus the Single Regional Authority, which clears up a lot of those issues.

Mr. Fauver stated that is the way the Consultant’s analysis comes out.

Mr. Haste stated that he is not sure that he agrees with that, only because governments have had to do that for years and they wouldn’t do it unless they are saving money. He would have faith in everybody that they could find a way to make it work. Otherwise, there is no reason to do it. There would be no existence for COGS if they couldn’t save money. He understands what they are thinking is that you have to have a paid entity out there to do it. He would be willing to bet that governments can come together and get the same thing done without additional staff.

Mr. Fauver stated that if you pick one or two items you may be able to make it work.

Mr. Hartwick stated that they need to address the priorities of where the areas of most benefit would be prior to entering into the agreement.

Mr. Saylor stated as a member of the CAT Board, he pointed out that every meeting he has attended, since he was appointed, they have had a discussion about sharing services. They have been having meetings about fare integration and sharing technology. Discussions are being held.

Mr. Fauver stated that he wouldn’t say that there isn’t any opportunity. The consultant’s work presents it that to take advantage of every opportunity it will add cost. To take advantage of individual opportunities there may be opportunities to take to lower costs in some areas. He doesn’t believe you are ever going to get the same kind of cost savings that you could get out of combining the authorities together.
Administrative Structure – there are about 125 full-time equivalent staff for administration between all the authorities. If it was a Single Regional Authority the consultant’s identified that it could be 96 employees.

Mr. Haste asked who the consultant was.

Mr. Fauver indicated that it was Vantage Point.

Mr. Saylor stated that it is administrative staff.

Mr. Fauver stated on the Shared Services, the consultant believed that if you were going to share all the activities that were proposed, you would end up needing to have additional staff to manage and coordinate that.

Financial Impact – The financial savings from the administrative costs for the Single Regional Authority, which doesn't include Berks and Lancaster, but also includes more detailed analysis than what was included in the first phase, they estimated to be about $2.4 million. There was a similar analysis, with similar estimates, not the same level, from Lancaster and Berks. When Lancaster and Berks made their decision to move forward, they achieved that same level of savings. They actually are achieving more since they are finding more things that they can save money on. They didn’t necessarily achieve it in the same way the study recommended.

Savings – You can spend it, save it, more services or to use to offset fare increases in the future. You can also take advantage of the Act 89 provision which would give you the ability to lower or eliminate local match for up to five years. If there were savings over and above that, you would have decisions to make.

Dauphin County’s Impact – Even the savings levels that the Consultant identified, all of the local match partners combined, their annual local match is less than that savings amount. In theory, if there was a decision made to do that all the local match partners and you achieved that level of savings that could eliminate their local match for up to five years. There are two components of this benefit. For Dauphin County, in FY 2014/2015, roughly $321,000 – the next year (FY 2015/2016) would be $337,000 and each year it would go up by 5%. That is a requirement under State law, because CAT was currently collecting less than 15% of the State share. State funding also grows. State funding increased at a higher rate than the 5%, so the local match percentage went down. In ten years, that 10-year total contribution by Dauphin County would be $4.25 million assuming that it contributed the full amount. With consolidation in FY 2014/2015 Dauphin would start at $321,000. The next five years Dauphin County would go to zero local match. That is real dollar savings. In year six, Dauphin County would resume paying at the FY 2014/2015 funding level. Over the ten year period, Dauphin County would have contributed $1.77 million.
Mr. Hartwick indicated that he has seen a lot of presentations where there has been a lot of benchmarks and goals that have been set, some have exceeded those proposals, some have not been realized. The idea of this Board having some level of accountability to the numbers and the ability to match what is being presented to this Board versus what the real savings are. Dauphin County has a great program here, which is the guaranteed energy savings program. The Board can quantify those year-by-year in actual real dollars to ensure that the County is achieving what has been proposed and anticipated based upon the structure presented. In this proposal there are a lot of variables and decisions to be made that would either move the County down a path of additional savings or reduce that opportunity.

Mr. Fauver stated that he can provide the real example from Lancaster and Berks.

Mr. Haste stated that he referred to Dauphin County’s local match – he assumes that every other county would.

Mr. Fauver stated that every local match partner, for Capital Area Transit, it is the City, Dauphin and Cumberland. All three of those entities would have this same experience, but it would be relative to their share that they contribute. He believes that Dauphin County contributes the largest amount in real dollars, so Dauphin County would achieve the most in real dollar savings.

Mr. Haste asked if it would be the same for Adams.

Mr. Fauver stated that Adams, York and Lebanon and Jonestown also contribute.

Mr. Haste asked if the County did that, it would be a big revenue dip for the single authority. He asked how they survive.

Mr. Fauver indicated that it is not a revenue dip. Sometimes in government you talk about savings, but really it is efficiencies. You are doing more with the dollars that are being spent. This is real savings. The consultants identified it by reducing the number of full-time equivalent staff that is involved in administration.

Mr. Haste stated that they are saying that by the County saving $2.3 million a year that there is enough money there to count off all those counties. So, the total savings in theory, all the paying entities is roughly $2.3 million.

Mr. Fauver stated in a single year. Over a ten year period for Dauphin County it would come out to $2.4 million. In the case of Lancaster and Berks, the guarantee comes in with the decisions that get made to establish the authority at the beginning. With Lancaster and Berks, they made real decisions, they reduced administrative staff complement and some of that they reduced by downsizing employees. Some of that they reduced because employees left on their own. Those positions were consolidated to achieve the savings. They have to be able to balance their budget. If they lost the local match and didn’t get real savings to offset that, they would be faced with service
challenges. They need to show that upfront and they will be tracked over the five year period.

Mr. Saylor asked what happens if they don’t.

Mr. Fauver indicated that you wouldn’t get the benefit. You would maybe get a proportional benefit. For example if they indicated that they were only going to achieve $1.5 million, because there was decisions made not to eliminate three positions because they like those people or whatever and that would cause all of the entities to not be able to get a full local match. They could only save 80%.

Mr. Hartwick stated that would be important as discussions are held on the priorities, local government structure and what would be the non-negotiables.

Mr. Fauver stated that is exactly where he was going to go next in the discussion. He mentioned Franklin and Perry Counties who don’t have fixed route service – what do they get out of this. What they get is the benefit of being part of a larger management structure for shared-ride and hopefully being able to stabilize their fare structure. They don’t get real dollar savings back to the County, like the counties with local match. Perry and Franklin were both part of the study. If there was a decision between fixed route counties to move forward and Perry and Franklin decided to opt into that their benefit is stability and being a part of a larger organization. It is not a dollar-for-dollar reduction in what they contribute, because their only contribution right now is due to losses in their system.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the only counter argument to that is a larger organization doesn’t necessarily mean the ability to provide the appropriate level of service at the time that they needed for their residents or would you argue that kind of capacity will allow for better service.

Mr. Fauver indicated that concern was raised a lot and until they had real experience he wasn’t sure about it either. They do have real experience with it. York County is managing Adams County and they have merged. York County is managing Northumberland County’s Shared-Ride. It is separated geographically from them. They have a joint call center. Technology has allowed them to go with the joint call center, so now they have people in York and people in Northumberland County that are a pool of people to answer phone calls. Because of the software that they using, they can schedule trips and make it all work. The drivers, rank and file people, are still delivering service are local. In the case of Northumberland, those people who are still the same people. You need to have local drivers. Cumberland County just recently made a decision to have their Shared-Ride Department managed by York County. There are savings to the system that are being gained.

Mr. Haste asked how the MPO’s address the funding, because PennDOT requires it to be done by MPO
Mr. Fauver stated that in the case of the fixed route side for the State funding, the statistics for each region still come in and go to the formula. From the State funding perspective, that is a choice that can be made by the local entities at the time they consolidate. You can either give them one set of statistics for that one authority and get one number back and combine the base together or you can still give them individual statistics and they can run those individual numbers, but you would file one application under one authority, but if you do that Dauphin County, Cumberland County and Harrisburg would still know how much State funding was being generated by their region.

Mr. Haste stated that they went to the Single Authority, in theory, the Single Authority would prioritize all the transit dollars and HATS would only receive information.

Mr. Fauver stated that in terms of State funding for operating assistance, yes. On the Federal side that is a little bit different. The Federal situation you would go to a single Federal grant to the authority, but Federal funding still has to be allocated out by MPOs, because the MPO region generates that Federal funding. The Federal funding that would have been coming to HATS normally still goes to HATS and still has to be programmed in the HATS area.

Mr. Haste stated HATS would transfer those dollars over to the Single Authority.

Mr. Fauver stated no, HATS doesn’t transfer. The Authority gets a direct grant from the FTA, but the Authority can’t spend any of that money until it is programmed on the HATS TIP, York TIP and be able to advance. It is a little bit different than Federal Highways.

Mr. Haste asked what happens if one of those MPOs doesn’t do that.

Mr. Fauver stated that the money just sits there, just like it does today. If they went to the MPO to program Federal funds to buy buses for the Harrisburg region then the MPO would have that choice, just like they do today.

There are so many different details like that and there are a lot of questions, especially about money and governance.

Mr. Hartwick asked if he could explain the governance option.

Mr. Fauver stated that the governance can be whatever people decide they want it to be. Generally when you have an authority it makes sense to try to have a board that is workable. There is one transit authority with 21 members. You would need to establish a size for governance and then a method by which board members are appointed.

Mr. Haste asked who establishes the MPOs and how would you change the MPOs.
Mr. Fauver indicated that he can’t answer that question. Jim Ritzman, Deputy for Planning, would be able to get an answer on that. The MPOs were originally established as a Federal function under ISTEA.

Mr. Haste stated that in HATS they tweaked it a bit with the whole Lebanon little piece.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he will get an answer.

Mr. Haste stated that it just, at times, seems silly to have multiple overlaying authorities when it might be easier.

Mr. Fauver stated that it is worth a discussion. That discussion is going on in a couple other places around the State.

Mr. Haste stated that MPOs get involved in more than just this.

Mr. Pries asked if he could let the public know what MPO stands for.

Mr. Fauver stated Metropolitan Planning Organization. It is the organization that in this region it is the Harrisburg Area Transportation Study (HATS). It is the organization that makes priority decisions on how Federal and State dollars are going to be spent on transportation improvements. That is across all modes. There are a bunch of planning factors that go in that as well. Often county planning offices work closely with them.

There are transition costs, but he doesn’t know exactly what they are. The Consultant’s estimated them at roughly $5 million for a Single Region Authority and $2.5 million if you went with the Shared Services Entity. Either way, it will cost some money. There are going to be legal costs and capital costs with IT systems, phone systems, etc. From dealing with the transition costs to make it happen, PennDOT is paying that cost 100%. This $5 million is being paid by PennDOT. Grants have already been given to the Lancaster/Berks group.

Mr. Haste asked if the payback then is PennDOT’s.

Mr. Fauver stated that is not a payback to PennDOT. That is efficiency. The $2.4 million would go to local government. They view this transition cost as a cost of making the service better and generating savings. It is worth it to them to put this money in. State funding continues to flow and that doesn’t get affected. The base of State funding, if it is combined together or it stays separate that continues to flow. You continue to get growth on that based upon the statistics. If you ended up putting real savings back into expanding service that expanded service would generate more miles, hours and riders, which would add more State funding to the region. They don’t reduce State funding to generate any of the savings. It is about maximizing dollars and making transit more efficient.
Mr. Saylor asked about the Shared Services this whole concept of the cost being $800,000. If the regional authorities were able to negotiate shared services without having the worst case scenario what the consultant envisions, theoretically that could be a zero or potentially some savings.

Mr. Fauver stated that if the authorities got together and generated real savings that they can track you can get the same benefit. The local government benefit can be the same. He doesn’t know if you could generate $2.4 million in annual savings, but if you generated $500,000 in annual savings you could split that up among the local government partners and get a local match reduction for five years for doing that.

Mr. Haste stated that you get that among the local partners that are participating in the savings.

Mr. Saylor asked if the Shared Services concept is happening anywhere else in the State.

Mr. Fauver stated not yet. Act 89 is fairly new and that concept was built into Act 89. It is a good concept. There are opportunities beyond this region. You don’t have to be geographically connected. For example – if this region decided that they were going to share a service with somewhere that is completely geographically disconnected from this region, but is something that could be shared together and generate savings as a result of it, that could also go to that. You are not limited to getting these savings just one time. You could consolidate and generate savings now and in the future if there is a new technology or something else that could generate real dollar savings if it was shared with someone else, you could get more savings in the future. That piece of the legislation doesn’t expire.

Mr. Haste stated that if the County was to go to one authority and it becomes much larger than it is now, what is the competitive advantage or disadvantage when you are competing against SEPTA and Allegheny County. He knows in the formula the smaller ones are not treated the same.

Mr. Fauver stated that they were disadvantaged prior to 2007. When the law was changed in 2007 and put a uniform formula on so it applies to everybody equally. Prior to 2007 money used to be broken into buckets. There was a bucket of funding for SEPTA, a bucket of funding for port authorities and a bucket of funding that all the smaller systems shared together. That was broken up by formula. It wasn’t the same. One of the things they did in 2007, they wrote a formula and put everyone on the same basis. Currently, a vehicle mile in this region gets the same dollar amount per vehicle mile as a vehicle mile in Southeast PA as it does in western PA. The more revenue vehicle miles, the more revenue vehicle hours, which is 65% of the formula between those two and the more passengers, which is 35% of the formula, the more dollars that will come to the region. They don’t give formula credit for administrative costs. If you can save administrative costs and save other money and put it into the service and get more riders you can get more money.
Mr. Haste stated that you get more money because of efficiencies, not more money because of the size of the authority.

Mr. Fauver indicated that was correct. He will send a presentation to Chad. Since 2007, the small systems have gotten big increases in operating assistance compared to the big systems. It is how the formula was set up to allow them to phase in to become equalized. You are getting a bigger increase in this region percentage wise than what Philadelphia is getting and definitely what the Port Authority is getting.

In terms of implementation, Washington County just made a decision to merge a couple authorities together. They are in the Phase II process. The first step in Phase I is critical issues discussion. Everyone needs to sit down and talk about governance, local match and any other issues that are critical to the partners.

Mr. Hartwick stated that next step is critical. He asked how timing is perceived and how it will occur.

Mr. Fauver stated that they have asked for comments on this report by the end of May.

Mr. Haste asked who the comments would be coming from.

Mr. Fauver stated from the stakeholders. Chad is part of that group.

Mr. Haste stated the Authority as well as the funding partners.

Mr. Fauver stated that if they need to make changes or find errors they are going to fix it. It is part of the reason why they haven’t released the full report. He wants to make sure that all the comments are received. Counties and local government partners are starting to ask them to come and visit with them. They are also following up with those who haven’t reached out yet. Lebanon County just reached out. They are working to schedule something with Cumberland County and the City of Harrisburg, York and Adams. They would have this similar discussion with those folks so they can think about whether or not they want to move forward into this critical issues discussion.

Mr. Hartwick asked how long those meetings will take.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he was hoping to get them all scheduled by the end of May. Lebanon unfortunately couldn’t happen until June. He was hoping for a decision to move ahead before the end of the State fiscal year with this critical issues discussion. It can take longer, but the decision is just saying here is the representative and what the issues are. They may end up with impasse items which will block something from moving ahead.

Mr. Haste asked if Mr. Fauver could talk to Vantage Point. He understands that the Shared will not see the same savings as Single. He is having a difficult time
understanding how Shared costs more instead of saving money. Almost in every other entity that he has seen of governments getting together it has been the other way around. He is keeping an open mind. He is skeptical of Vantage Point’s analysis on that. He would like for them to convince him that it costs more money.

Mr. Fauver stated that he made Vantage Point convince him and he can see how, based on the assumptions that they made, how they can get to that same conclusion. He struggled with it as well. Part of the reason why they wanted to give some time to the authorities to join to give comments is to get comments back from them so they can do further analysis. They have other consultants that they can use. They may end up using a different consultant to take a look at it again. He believes the way that they looked at it is right – if you threw everything into the bucket you are going to need something to manage it. If you pick off one or two items that you can get agreement on and really figure out how to make it work you may be able to make one or two items work.

Mr. Haste stated that without having that discussion, it is not fair to Mr. Fauver because he is the translator.

Mr. Fauver stated that is the reason they have asked for comments.

Mr. Haste stated that it almost appears like Vantage Point took an anti-share approach and a pro Single approach, because in the Single side they didn’t weigh in if something doesn’t work or they didn’t use the staff scenario. He would expect the Shared to have a savings, but not as great as a Single. He is just trying to understand it.

Mr. Fauver stated that during this comment period if authorities come back and say here are one or two items that they think they can share and generate savings on then they can analyze that.

Mr. Hartwick stated that was his opening discussion was about the Consultants, to talk about their philosophy and the guarantees to meet the projections that are in here. He doesn’t think it would be a bad idea if they could meet with Vantage Point. He wants to make sure it is done right. It might not be a bad idea of someone else taking a look at it and validating the argument just so you have some level of comparison and another viewpoint.

Mr. Fauver indicated that can be done easily. Vantage Point has been their go to sort of transit accounting analysis firm. He thanked the Commissioners for having him at the meeting.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There was none.
HUMAN RESOURCES

Ms. Lengle asked if there were any questions. (There was none.) She indicated that she has a few changes on the Personnel Transactions Listing. The changes are as follows: #26 – the start date should be changed to 06/08/2015, #34 – the start date should be changed to 04/30/2015, #46 – the start date should be changed to 07/06/2015 and #47 – the start date should be changed to 05/25/2015.

She indicated that she would like a vote on #1, #3, #34, #35, #39, #40 and #41.

Mr. Saylor asked when the Hiring Window is open.

Ms. Lengle indicated that it was to be the next packet.

Mr. Saylor indicated that some of these are important with Children & Youth.

Ms. Lengle indicated that some of them could have waited, but she had so many she thought she would put them through. Some of them are not starting for a while. Some of them were because of providing notice.

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve #1, #3, #34, #35, #39, #40 and #41 of the Personnel Transactions Listing.

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

The Salary Board Packet and the remainder of the Personnel Packet will be considered at next week’s Legislative Meeting.

PURCHASE ORDERS

Mr. Baratucci indicated that the Packets were distributed yesterday and this is the second week in a row that there were no budget issues. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)

The Purchase Order Packet will be considered at next week’s Legislative Meeting.

TRAINING PACKET

It was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve Item #10 of the Training Packet.

Question: Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. Pries – Aye and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.
ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

There was none.

SOLICITOR’S REPORT – JOE CURCILLO, III, ESQ.

Mr. Curcillo reported that with the exception of a few items that may be pulled, everything else will be ready for next week. (There were no questions.)

CHIEF CLERK’S REPORT – CHAD SAYLOR

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

COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

Mr. Hartwick reported that NACo had a series of Capitol Hill briefings. One talked about the Excise Tax and the elimination of the “Cadillac” tax on both private business and government for offering healthcare beyond what the scope of the Affordable Care Act will allow without a penalty under the ACA. There is a bipartisan movement to address penalizing those individuals and corporations and government that try to offer benefits to employees without penalizing the taxpayers. It is something that this Board is on board with. It is one of the parts of the Affordable Care Act that is definitely not sending the right message. There was a sponsorship piece of legislation that was moved and it was gaining sponsors.

The second item was the discussion about the CDBG Program. The President’s budget had the actual amount of CDBG continuing to decline in his budget proposal to about $2.2 billion. It was great to hear out of Congress and the House & Urban Affairs Committee; they had a mark-up of the bill that reflected $3 billion and on discussion with the Senate about $3.3 billion. That means that it may work out to something in-between. There was some direct conversation about what it is being used for and flexibility and how important that is to local governments. The discussion went very well and hopefully the Board will be hearing some good news related to block grant allocations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

RECESS

Mr. Haste, with the concurrence of his colleagues, recessed the Commissioners’ Meeting and will leave it open for an Election Board Meeting. When the Election Board is adjourned, he will adjourn the Commissioners’ Meeting.
ELECTION BOARD

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Commissioners’ Workshop Meeting was adjourned.
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