DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

LEGISLATIVE MEETING

JULY 15, 2015
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Haste, Chairman
Mike Pries, Vice Chairman
George P. Hartwick, III, Secretary

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Janis Creason, Treasurer; Joseph A. Curcillo, III, Esq., Solicitor; August Memmi, Director of Community & Economic Development; Steve Libhart, Director of EMA; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Mike Yohe, Director of Budget & Finance; Jennifer Simpson, Court Administration; Daniel Schramm, Solicitor’s Office; Kay Lengle, Human Resources; Greg Schneider, Budget & Finance; Melody Osborn, Commissioners’ Office and Richie-Ann Martz, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Walt Desiderio, Arlene Friner, John Keller, Mike Clapsadl, Steve Holmes, Lionel Randolph, Tom Connolly, Susan Wilson, Barb Miller, James Roxbury, Karl Singleton, Toby Fauver and Bill Jones

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:10 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. Haste that the Board approve the June 24, 2015 Workshop Meeting Minutes and the July 1, 2015 Legislative Meeting Minutes; motion carried.

It was moved by Ms. Rebuck and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve the July 1, 2015 Salary 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 and Arlene Friner

1. Presentation on Transit Regionalization

Mr. Fauver stated that he appreciates coming back to further discuss the consolidation and shared services study that was completed. There were some questions on shared services and he offered to bring the consultant in that actually did the work. He introduced Arlene Friner from Vantage Point. Arlene and her partner Walt Desiderio conducted the study.

Ms. Friner indicated that she is going to focus on the shared services results of the regionalization study. Toby had presented the total results to the Board earlier. As a reminder, for shared services, the study ended up showing that there would be a projected increase in cost primarily due to the increase of positions, approximately 2.8 FTE (Full-time Equivalent) employees. That, in combination with operating costs, would generate an increase in costs of about $840,000.

Mr. Saylor stated that for the purposes of the folks in the room, he asked if she could mention as a background shared services versus combined authority.

Ms. Friner stated that they were tasked with analyzing two different operating scenarios. The first was a single regional authority, which was envisioned to be a new municipal
authority and all of the existing transit agencies (six) would be combined into one single regional authority. The second alternative, which is the one that they are talking about today was a new entity which would focus on shared services. It would not be a transit operating entity, like the single regional authority, but instead would provide a series of services that all of the existing transit authorities in the region could use. They are focusing on the second alternative and what the results were from that analysis and why there is projected to be an increase in costs, if a shared services entity was established as opposed to a single regional authority where one would see significant cost reductions.

The assumptions that were used in putting together the shared services alternative – the first is that the transit agencies in the region would continue to exist and generally operate as they do today. There would be no changes to their operating service and a new shared service entity would be formed. It could be formed as a non-profit or as a municipal authority. That shared services entity would provide a series of services such as procurement, legal, expertise in human resource management and marketing. The purpose of the shared services entity is to do a number of things. One is to provide a set of services for functions that are not being performed today or are only being performed on a limited basis, either because the transit agencies involved are so small that they just don’t have the funds to hire the right full-time staff or it could be that it is an area where you need some professional expertise and you don’t necessarily need to have a full-time person. If you establish a shared services entity, for example, you could have one expert in human resource compliance needs and that one person could serve all six transit agencies. Instead of each of the transit agencies hiring that one person, they could share one. That is the concept of the shared services organization.

Mr. Desiderio stated that if you asked any one of the general managers in the region what they need to do in order to run the transit system the way they would like. The consistent response, with given the limited dollars that they have to work with, they have to prioritize where they place those administrative dollars. Some of it may be due to the size of the organization and they can only do so much. You also have situations where as a General Manager they have to prioritize where those dollars are placed. As an example, marketing in his particular transit system may not fall, not by choice, but at the end of the day may not fall at the top of that priority ladder. He is limited in how many marketing dollars that he can put to whether it is website development or public outreach. Procurement and compliances Arlene touched upon, the FTA places an immense responsibility in terms of compliance requirements on these general managers. These general managers wear multiple hats in order to perform multiple functions and they don’t have the ability to go out and hire designated people to perform nothing but that one particular task. It is those responsibility gaps that shared services is intended to pick up the slack and fulfill those responsibilities on a shared concept for the transit systems that would participate in that kind of a concept.

Ms. Friner stated that one of the reasons they look at shared services as an alternative is because the first analysis for a single regional authority, the combination of all the six organizations together provides one with the ability, even though you are reducing staff,
because of consolidation, it provides the ability to hire those individual specialists that can serve the region instead of one transit agency. The shared services concept is trying to create a different organizational alternative to what you would see as a benefit in a single regional authority. There are some things that the shared services entity would not do. As an example, three of the six transit agencies in the region are county-operated transit departments. So, in those instances, you might have the county’s human resources officer providing the human resource services to that transit department. You will have payroll being performed by the county, the benefits administration and pension plans of the transit employees all managed by the county.

Mr. Haste asked what three do that now.

Ms. Friner indicated that it is Perry, Franklin and Cumberland.

Mr. Haste asked if Cumberland is part of CAT.

Ms. Friner stated only with regard to fixed route service. Cumberland County was responsible for demand response service on its own. In those instances, the shared services entity is not going to be able to provide those payroll services, as an example, because those counties are going to be performing that service. It doesn’t make sense to shift those responsibilities to an external organization only for a piece of the county’s operation. There are also some responsibilities that are fiduciary responsibilities of the individual transit agencies such as the annual audit. That is something that you are not going to contract out. The management of the responsibility, certainly you would contract the actual audit performance, but not the management of it. When you take a look at any regionalization alternative, including shared services, typically they find five areas where you will see regionalization resulting in financial savings. The first area is salary and benefit savings from administrative position reductions. Today you have six general managers, six assistants to those general managers and six finance officers for each of the organizations. When you regionalize into a single authority, all you need is one of each. On the administrative staff that is where you will see in a single regional authority those administrative position savings. Once you combine six organizations that today might have a whole variety of types and levels of benefit packages, once a single entity is formed you would only have one benefit plan, other than those related to the represented employees. You will end up with a single benefit plan. Typically you will see some level of change, particularly when you take a look at retirement plans. If you move from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan, which is typically what you see happening, your costs will decrease.

The next area is in the service contracts area. Typically you will also see some savings from duplicate service contracts. Earlier she mentioned that there is a need for an annual audit for the six individual transit agencies that exist today. If you move to a single regional authority, you only need one audit and therefore only one audit contract. You will only need one contract for legal advice, instead of six. In the professional services area, you will see savings in service contracts when you regionalize. You will also see office related costs decline. You might consolidate facilities and see a
reduction in space requirements. You will also see smaller savings related to the purchase of paper, pens, computers, etc. for the staff, which would decrease as a result of regionalization. Finally, for those counties that provide transit service as a county department, what you will find is that those counties are spending dollars outside of that department for overhead expenses. Payroll is typically not part of the transit department, but it is a function of the finance department of the county. In many cases, those costs are allocated or paid by those departments. Those departments will use their grant funds to pay for those allocated costs. When you regionalize, you no longer have those allocated costs, because the counties are not going to provide those services anymore, because you have an independent municipal authority. Those are the key areas where you would typically see savings.

The first area mentioned was administrative position reductions and the salaries and benefits associated. Why don’t you see that in a shared services concept? She mentioned in the shared services entity it primarily provides services for functions that are not being performed today. You have to increase positions in the shared services entity to perform those functions. Those additional people will create incremental costs.

Mr. Desiderio stated that without any offsetting reductions from positions in the existing agencies. That is where the net increase of the shared services concept arises.

Ms. Friner stated that what you would normally see in a single regional entity where she mentioned that you would reduce the general managers from six to one, in shared services since those six entities still remain and they operate exactly as they do today, you will still have the six general managers and six finance officers so there is no savings to be seen to offset the increased costs at the shared services entity. What you might see are productivity improvements at the existing agencies. The existing managers are multi-tasking and instead of being responsible for 20 different functions they are now responsible for 17 or 18 functions. You will see an increase in their productivity. For example, you are not going to eliminate the chief mechanical officer at each transit agency, because that officer still is required to perform a whole host of other tasks even if the shared services entity might be responsible for the procurement of maintenance inventory. You are still keeping to the six chief mechanical officers, plus you have the shared services entity that is now providing the procurement of the inventory that those six chief mechanical officers will use.

Finally, the shared services entity itself will have an executive director and a finance officer. Those are two new positions that have to be funded so those are incremental costs. The standardization of benefits – that was the second primary area. There is no standardization of benefits in a shared services concept, because the existing agencies continue to operate as they do today, providing their respective benefit packages to the existing employees. There is no way to grasp any savings that way. Service contracts – the new shared services entity is going to have to have their own professional service contracts. They will have to have an annual audit and legal advice. You will have an increase in costs for those new professional services contracts. Without consolidating the existing six agencies you will not eliminate any of those duplicate service contracts,
except to the extent that the shared services entity might provide those services. You will see some savings, but because of the increases in the service contracts you will end up not seeing any savings in service. For office related expenses, you now have a new shared services entity that has to go out and rent office space. It is a new cost that increases the overall cost of operations. The shared services entity has to buy their own laptops, servers, pens and paper. Those are additional costs that get added to the overall financial impact of this alternative. Without consolidating each of the six entities, you will not get the advantages of the reduced administrative positions and therefore you will not see any savings resulting from their office related costs. Finally, the allocated county costs. In the shared services case, since those counties will continue to provide those services to the three transit agencies that are county departments, they will continue to charge their overhead costs to the agencies and therefore there will be no savings to the region. That is a quick summary describing both the areas that they look at for savings and why in this particular case, the shared services alternative does not produce the savings that a single authority would and in fact ends up costing you a little more than what is being paid today in the region.

Mr. Desiderio stated that they struggled long and hard looking at this scenario to see how it could possibly work. It was very clear to them, before interviewing one person, that this was probably most likely the preferred scenario that regional participants would like to see. The only way that this can work is through the creation of a separate shared services entity. You have to be able to identify existing positions in the six existing transit providers that can be eliminated, with the concurrence of a general manager agreeing, but this separate agency or entity is going to be able to provide those services satisfactorily to those six general managers. Setting aside the satisfaction level, it was clear to them that there were literally no existing positions that would be able to be reduced from the existing six agencies that would offset the addition of positions that are necessary in order to give the Board the outlook that they were looking for. That is compared to what it costs the six agencies today. It has nothing to do with the approximate $3 million that could be saved by one single regional transit municipality. This is compared to what it costs today. The comparison that they are discussing is about shared services to current costs today.

Mr. Haste asked what the name of the firm is.

Mr. Desiderio stated that it is Vantage Point Associates from Philadelphia.

Mr. Haste stated that he fully understands that a shared program doesn’t have the same savings as combining into one regional. Even with the explanation, he still doesn’t buy it that it is going to cost more. The study is making some assumptions that quite frankly don’t have to happen and doubt that they would happen. The study is assuming that you create a new entity, staff and space. This is Central Pennsylvania; we don’t do it that way. There would not be new staff, new space or those added costs. For years this Board has heard that we need to do more with less. Dauphin County has gotten pretty good at doing that. Each one of the folks affiliated with this that he has spoken to have no intention of adding staff, space or further equipment. That $800,000 is “bunk”.
It is not going to be. He asked Toby on the regional approach, how did these counties come into play instead of another mix of counties. He asked how the six got picked to be in the new region.

Mr. Fauver stated that they did not pick the counties. They asked if there was interest and the agencies expressed interest in participating in the study and they got resolutions from each one of the counties saying that they wanted to participate.

Mr. Haste asked why wasn’t Berks, Lancaster or Schuylkill included.

Mr. Fauver stated that Berks and Lancaster was included. Schuylkill decided not to participate. Berks and Lancaster, once they agreed to merge, asked to be excluded from the second phase, because they were in the process of creating their own merger.

Mr. Haste stated that he has had some discussions with them and he believes they would be interested. In some ways it makes more sense for Dauphin to go that way. He talked to folks and if this was going to happen, Dauphin, Lebanon fit better with Lancaster and Berks than it does with York.

Mr. Fauver stated that all the counties that participated from the beginning. Berks and Lancaster agreed to merge independently and they asked to be removed from the second phase of the study, because they were focused on consolidating.

Mr. Haste indicated that he understands that, because of timing. This is more about trying to make a pitch that the shared services don’t work than to try to find a way to make it work. He doesn’t buy this study at all.

Mr. Fauver stated that anything you get out of shared services is a benefit. If you pool fuel purchasing together, you will save money. Any of the additional human resources benefits or IT benefits, they are offsetting cost savings from shared services versus consolidation. The only thing that the consultants did is focused on what the differences are and where the opportunities were to save money over and above normal activity. He had some of the same questions. In terms of staffing, the shared services entity versus the not staffing the shared services entity, he sort of gets the comment about not adding staff, however, if there wasn’t some organizational strategy or structure set up to manage any shared services that moves forward, you will have a series of executive directors and boards that, if they are not in total agreement, are going to pull those things apart eventually. That is what happened with Berks and Lancaster when they shared IT services. They hired one person to support IT. When that person left they did not pursue that again. They went with their own independent IT contracts. When one agency called and the other agency called, they both wanted the service at the same time and there wasn’t anything in between to manage it and it became a challenge.
Mr. Haste stated that it still doesn’t work if you don’t have the agreement of the six. You could still have the agreement from the six; you are talking about 2.8 positions out of six units.

Ms. Friner stated that is a net number, not a gross number. There are many more positions at the shared services entity than 2.8.

Mr. Fauver stated that these are the assumptions that were made. If you think it could be done without adding additional staff or if there is an opportunity for savings, he would encourage the executive directors and the boards to get together and figure out ways to do it. The whole purpose of this is to save administrative money.

Mr. Haste stated that he believes going regional is the way to go. He is not sure that this is the right path. To some degree you are creating a new partnership, you need to be in a position where the partners can work together and get along. There are more natural ways to do that.

Mr. Pries thanked them for their presentation. If Berks and Lancaster were part of a regionalized approach, that would make Dauphin the central location. Right now, Dauphin is on the eastern end, right next to Lebanon. That would be nice if those two were on board. He would like to gather some more information. He is a big fan of the regionalized approach and he thinks that could work in the future. He is aware of the great work that the folks at CAT do. It was mentioned about the general managers and the hats they wear. That is an indication of the amount of work that they do above and beyond what the public is aware of. He asked what the folks in Franklin and Adams are saying about this.

Mr. Desiderio stated that Franklin County operates shared-ride only.

Mr. Pries asked if Dauphin was the first visit for these updates.

Mr. Fauver indicated that they have met with all the counties that contribute local match. Franklin County doesn’t contribute local match. Franklin is shared-ride only.

Mr. Pries asked if anyone is balking at this idea right now.

Mr. Fauver stated that he hasn’t heard that from Cumberland County. Lebanon County has some questions, which he is in the process of responding to. He has not heard any concerns from York. He hasn’t heard any concerns from Franklin County; he just doesn’t know what they want to do. Dauphin had some questions.

Mr. Saylor asked if Mr. Fauver made a presentation before the City.

Mr. Fauver indicated yes. They made a presentation before the City. The City had a few questions. One of the questions was what are all the local match contributions by all the other parties and what are the savings that the other parties would get out of it.
table is being put together to send out to everybody. Other than that the City didn’t have any further questions when he made that presentation.

Mr. Pries stated that in a perfect world for Toby and PennDOT – what would something like this look like if it was geographically spread out.

Mr. Fauver stated that he didn’t know. Where some of this came from is going back prior to Act 44 in 2007. The Commissioners have seen this over and over again. Transit agencies struggle to get operating funds. It is either feast or famine. They either have an increase in funds and they have a period of years where they can operate and then they seem to run out of funding, because costs increase at a rate faster than funding can keep up. What is a way to help make transit agencies more sustainable – find ways to reduce costs? This was borne out of that concept in trying to find ways to reduce costs. It is not necessarily an idea to try to create more or fewer systems or bigger regional entities – there is no generation from that. From his perspective it is about where are the opportunities to save money, generate savings and produce better results.

Mr. Hartwick stated that from a region, the idea of bringing in the population basis, one of the big pushes for this is to be able to get on a public transit and be able to travel from Lancaster to Harrisburg, Berks, larger population sources that will allow for tourism opportunities. The idea of getting off an airport and being able to see Gettysburg to Amish country to Hershey/Harrisburg Region is the way it should be. Lancaster, Berks and Schuylkill are a larger population basis and from that 10-county region if you are looking at the ability to negotiate for a better amount of leverage, the ability to have the kind of ridership that will support those kinds of investment, as well as the leverage to make sure that the investments that are made in the public transit system really are ones that allow both a Federal presence and a State presence to be able to make the case. From his perspective, to miss that loop is missing an opportunity that really should be revisited. He is supportive of the regional approach. The folks that work there and have contracts should all be in the same position that they are currently, but he thinks there are better ways to operate efficiently and not miss the opportunity of a larger opportunity that would really engage everyone to see that kind of relationship and planning. He was asking United States Transportation Secretary Fox about some public transportation and larger geographic and the more population base that can come with innovative concepts, the better position we have to see both revenue, the opportunity for shared services and an opportunity for tourism that exists. He doesn’t know what it takes to get back to the table. He doesn’t know if they were excluded from the mix, but he would like to see those other counties engaged in this process.

Mr. Fauver stated that a meeting is coming up to try to get the counties together. Cumberland County has initiated it. The meeting is to talk about regionalization and one of the persons coming to talk about it is a Berks County Commissioner who is also on the Board for the new Authority between Lancaster and Berks. That might provide an opportunity for this Board to discuss that with them.
Mr. Hartwick stated that they have a good working relationship with Berks and Lancaster. He thinks it makes a whole lot of sense to include them in the mix.

Mr. Pries stated that if Berks, Lancaster and Schuylkill then you look at the central tourism location, Dauphin with Hershey/Harrisburg, Adams, which is Gettysburg and Lancaster, centrally located in this 10-county region which makes geographic sense.

Mr. Fauver stated that it is one of those things that you have to figure out where to start and then how you get there.

Mr. Hartwick stated that gives the chance to discuss other public transportation options, amongst those tourism destinations.

Mr. Saylor stated that in terms of the next steps to follow up on what Mr. Fauver mentioned, he is working with his counterpart in Cumberland County. They did schedule a meeting for next Wednesday at 1:30 p.m. at the Fort Hunter Centennial Barn. All of the Commissioners and the City has been invited to participate. The agenda will feature the Executive Director of the Berks/Lancaster Regional Authority and also Kevin Barnhardt, who is Berks County Commissioner. The focus of that conversation is going to be how the transition happened, what were the challenges and successes and what have the results been since. If the intention is to move forward with this he asked Mr. Fauver what the next steps would be.

Mr. Fauver stated that if there is interest in moving forward with discussion on governance other issues that are going to be critical to how board representation would be established, local match contribution, and critical things will be set up in a charter for a new organization. They would like to have a person represent each of the local match contributors to be able to sit down in some negotiating sessions with the other local match contributors to try to sort out those issues and see if those individuals can come up with a plan that can be recommended back to the elected officials in each governing body to consider adopting.

Mr. Hartwick asked if it is too far down the road to include other partners.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he didn’t think so. That is very similar to the discussion that occurred between Lancaster and Berks. He doesn’t know where Lancaster and Berks would be in terms of wanting to move ahead to participate in the next step here or not or whether it makes sense to consider taking the next step here in this region and then look to establish an authority and then look to merge the two authorities together. He doesn’t know what the right next set of steps are, but certainly maybe discussing some of that next week would be helpful.

Mr. Haste stated that if we want to do a regional, it should be done right. To him that includes Schuylkill, Berks and Lancaster. They have talked for years about the economic triangle between Dauphin (Hershey/Harrisburg), Gettysburg and Lancaster, when people come to this region those three areas are the big draws. If you do not
connect those three then you are leaving one part of that triangle out you are not accomplishing what you are supposed to do. He is either in, but he is not buying half of a pie. He is going to have that discussion with Lancaster and Berks.

Mr. Hartwick thanked the folks for their presentation.

**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. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick 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 reported that there was one addition to the Packet on Page 14. It was approved by Commissioner Haste. It is for some spill kits for the Safety Committee which they will distribute to different departments. All the other budget issues were addressed. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)

> It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries 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 provided the following Investment Report:

> **Report from the Office of Budget & Finance**
> **July 15, 2015**

- **July 3, 2015** transferred $338,316.72 to the Payables account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.
- **July 10, 2015** transferred $2,120,343.36 to the Payables account and $1,922,241.76 to the Payroll account from the County’s Concentration account for checks issued that week.

- **Wire Payments since last report:** $727,703.51

- **Debt Service Payments since last report:** $0.00

- **Term Investments**
  - 3/25/15 - $2,000,000.00 6-month CD – Centric Bank – 0.35% - matures 9/25/15
  - 5/12/15 - $5,000,000.00 9-month CD – Customers Bank – 0.59% - matures 2/6/16
  - 5/12/15 - $5,000,000.00 12-month CD – Customers Bank – 0.84% - matures 5/11/16

- **Balance today in PA INVEST account #2100017144860:** $1,381.05 rate 0.050%

- **Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #10013172621:** $18,524,591.16 rate 0.250%

- **Balance today in Susquehanna Bank investment account #119002023:** $1,069.16 rate 0.050%

- **Balance today in First National Bank investment account #97014743:** $9,600,334.59 rate 0.300%

- **Balance today in Integrity Bank Money Market Checking account #2206001209:** $22,620,636.19 rate 0.300%

- **Balance today in Santander Bank investment account #9551017714:** $15,053,502.76 rate 0.300%

- **Balance today in Metro Bank investment account #539014068:** $10,014,278.37 rate 0.300%


**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 reported that everything on the Solicitor’s Report is ready for approval. He asked if there were any questions. (There was none.)
MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION

A. Request to contribute the County’s pro rata share for appraisal services and trial costs needed to ascertain the true value of U. D. Properties – Parcel #62-023-044-000-0000 (2800 Valley Road) – Docket #2014-CV-8381-TX.

B. Subordination Agreement for Mark J. Swalm on the property located at 2006 Wexford Drive, Palmyra, PA 17078.

C. Repository Bid received from Nathan Duanne Turbyfill – Parcel #57-022-001 (S. Front Street) - $500.00.

D. Repository Bid received from Terra Nova Development Corporation – Parcel #63-003-109 (Bonnymead Avenue) - $1,000.00.


F. Senior Center Grant Agreement between Dauphin County (AAA) and The Heinz-Menaker Senior Center, Inc.

G. Purchase of Service Agreements between Dauphin County (Children & Youth) and:
   1. Children’s Home of Reading, Inc.
   2. Families United Network, Inc.
   3. Discovery Kids Child Care Center, Inc. #1
   4. Discovery Kids Child Care Center, Inc. #2
   5. Language Line Services, Inc.
   6. Triple P America, Inc.

H. Amendment #2 to Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County (Children & Youth) and Triple P America, Inc.

I. Adoption Assistance Agreement #2015-20.

J. Subsidized Legal Custodianship Agreements #2015-09 and #2015-17.

K. Subsidized Legal Custodianship Agreement Amendment #1 – 2014-07.

L. Purchase of Service Agreement between Dauphin County (MH/ID) and Fauzia Sheikh, M.D.

M. Agreement between Dauphin County (District Attorney’s Office) and South Central EMS for the distribution of naloxone to law enforcement agencies within Dauphin County.

N. Satisfaction Piece for Catherine L. Prunty on the property located at 10 Jones Street, Oberlin, PA 17113 - $5,000.

O. Budget Amendments for the quarter ending June 30, 2015.

P. BrewFest Brewery Travel Stipend:
1. Appalachian Brewing Co. - $125
2. Delmar Brewing Co. – Evolution Brewing Co. - $125
3. Victory Brewing Co. - $125
4. Straub Brewing Co. - $125
5. Lancaster Brewing Co. - $125
6. Roy-Pitz Brewing Co. - $125
7. Boston Beer Co. – Samuel Adams & Traveler Beer Co. - $250
8. Troegs Brewing Co. - $125
9. W&L Sales – Yards Brewing Co. - $125
10. Molly Pitcher Brewing Co. - $125

Q. Scope of Work and Fee Proposal from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. as a supplement to the existing Federal Aid Agreement for Bridge #32 Duke Street replacement project.

R. Resolution #24 - 2015 Application for County Aid – Derry Township in the amount of $81,190.00.


T. Engagement Addendum between Dauphin County and The Kapoor Company for labor relations.


W. Training Packet.

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

Discussion

Mr. Hartwick mentioned Item M. It has been a while since they have been able to secure resources for the distribution of naloxone to local law enforcement agencies. In Delaware County there has been the ability to save at least 35 lives and the ability to get that essential drug that reverses the effects of opioid overdoses and heroin overdoses to local law enforcement has proven to be able to save lives. He gave credit to the District Attorney for continuing to move this forward and finding resources and also to Capital Blue Cross for providing the resources necessary to make sure that the County puts naloxone in the hands of the law enforcement agencies that choose to participate that will allow people to read articles about law enforcement not being in a bad position and having negative relationships with the citizenry, but allowing them to be in a position to be public servants and save lives. He would encourage all of those agencies within Dauphin County to take advantage. It is free for the local municipalities to
take advantage of this. There is really no liability. The Good Samaritan Law and the ability for protection to be able to administer this life saving drug is something that is essential in the public health crisis that the county is going through. Credit to the District Attorney and hopefully encourage every law enforcement agency in Dauphin County to participate and take advantage of the opportunity to save lives and to really be proactive in addressing how the Board can be helpful in this public health crisis.

Mr. Haste stated that he believes most have already had conversations with the District Attorney, but he will be the one that coordinates this effort and program. Any departments that are out there that have an interest need to be talking with the District Attorney’s Office.

**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. Hartwick stated that they had a successful National election (NACo) this week and the ability to participate and be in a leadership role for issues about having institutions of corrections being the largest provider of mental health services is a travesty in our society. With the closing of the State hospital and the lack of access for mental health services they need to figure out ways to find the ability to provide treatment to individuals who are dealing with significant mental illness. He is hopeful that the mental health court in this county will be reestablished, the ability for the County to start to provide real diversion. They are going to take a tour of all services that will be provided as an alternative to incarceration for those individuals struggling with mental illness and co-occurring disorders. A new facility opened up at the Shimmel School that is the first out-patient facility that deals with both mental illness and drug & alcohol addiction, the ability to get folks into treatment, external to the prison systems is something that they know is essential. In America, the criminal justice institutions are the largest provider of mental health services and they know that they are ill-equipped to do it and they see people coming in and out of the prison system over and over again. We need to think differently about the way these services are provided. NACo’s President Sally Clark is going to make this the number one priority nationally. In August, they cancelled both the Human Services Policy Committee and the Corrections Committee to be able to focus specifically on legislative remedies to be able to suspend versus terminate benefits to be able to provide regional facilities for forensic needs, to give specific
legislative proposal as a result of this discussion to be able to reduce the number of mentally ill individuals in the prison systems and to find alternatives for treatment and figure out ways, through the expansion of behavioral health services under Obama care to be able to provide treatment external to County taxpayer dollars. They have a concern about making sure people receive treatment, but even if your concern is just financial they cannot continue to provide and once folks walk in the prison door healthcare and a fee for the individuals who are in prison who are not getting better who pose a significant challenge and a risk to the individuals who are working in the prison, including themselves. We have to do better for people who are struggling with mental illness. He is looking forward to engaging in a serious national and local discussion with specific solutions to be able to address this crisis.

Mr. Haste stated that August is the state level, CCAP.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

A. Receipt of a letter from Andrew Kenworthy advising that he is resigning from the Dauphin County Land Bank Authority.

B. Notification from Gannett Fleming advising that Pennsylvania American Water (PAW) is applying to DEP for a Subsidiary Water Allocation Permit, which will allow PAW to use treated water from the City of Lebanon Authority.

C. Notification from R. J. Fisher & Associates, Inc. advising that UGI Utilities is applying to DEP for a General Permit 5 for the Route 39 Gas Extension in West Hanover Township.

D. Notification from Glace Associates, Inc. advising that Lykens Borough is applying to DEP for a Joint Application for the Rattling Creek Stream bank Repairs in Lykens Borough.

E. Notification from the United States Department of the Interior advising that they are applying to DEP for a Joint Permit Waiver 16 application for the Deep Creek Project in Lykens Township.

F. Receipt of a letter from Millersburg Borough, Inc. advising that they have applied for a $200,000 grant from the PA Department of Community & Economic Development ’s Greenways, Trails and Recreation Program for the Millersburg MYO Park Centennial Revitalization Project.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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