DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKSHOP MEETING

MAY 13, 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; Marie E. Rebuck, Controller; Janis Creason, Treasurer; Joseph A. Curcillo, III, Esq., Solicitor; Randy Baratucci, Director of Purchasing; Fred Lighty, Esq., Solicitor’s Office; Tom Guenther, Director of IT; Steve Libhart, Director of EMA; August Memmi, Director of Community & Economic Development; Jennifer Simpson, Court Administration; Kay Lengle, Human Resources; Daniel Schramm, Solicitor’s Office; Amy Harinath, Press Secretary; J. Scott Burford, Deputy Chief Clerk; James Bruno, Commissioners’ Office; Julie Mackey, Commissioners’ Office; Melody Osborn, Commissioners’ Office and Richie-AAnn Martz, Assistant Chief Clerk

GUESTS PRESENT

Barb Miller, Josh Eisner, Philip Durgin, Dave Eckhart, Tim Carson, James Roxbury, Tom Connelly and Amanda St. Hilaire (WHTM)

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:09 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 were no Executive Sessions held between meetings.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was none.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS

A. Philip Durgin, Executive Director, PA Legislative Budget & Finance Committee

1. Pennsylvania’s 911 Emergency Telephone System: Funding, Expenditures and Future Challenges and Opportunities

Mr. Haste stated that Mr. Durgin is here to discuss the 911 funding issues, which is now in the Senate.

Mr. Saylor indicated that he is very appreciative that Mr. Durgin made some time to come in and make this presentation for the Board.

Mr. Durgin indicated that he is the Executive Director of the Legislative Budget & Finance Committee. They are a legislative committee, both House and Senate members, that does studies as directed by the Legislature. One of which was on the Pennsylvania’s 911 Telephone System Statewide. He is here to talk about the study, and some specifics to Dauphin County. The report which the Committee released in May 2012 contains 24 different finding areas, several of which have multiple recommendations. He will limit his remarks to what he understands to be a primary area of interest, mainly what steps counties can take to ensure they are receiving all the funding they are entitled to under the current system. Pennsylvania’s 911 program is funded by several different types of surcharges. Wire line surcharges vary from $1.00 to $1.50 per month, depending on the class of the county; with larger counties have the smaller surcharges. As a third class county, Dauphin County falls in the middle range.
with a surcharge of $1.25 per wire line. These wire line revenues go directly to the county. Also wireless customers who receive bills from provider pay $1.00 per month for 911 services. Since 2011, a $1.00 surcharge is added to the cost of a prepaid phone or minutes purchased during retail transactions. These funds go to the Commonwealth and then are distributed to the counties through a rather complex grant formula. One of their study objectives was to try to determine if all the telephone providers that are required to collect surcharges are actually collecting them and if so are they collecting and submitting the correct amounts. Unfortunately, they were unable to do that, because wire line telephone services are regulated by the PUC (Public Utility Commission). They were able to get a listing of all the incumbent and competitive local exchange carriers operating in Pennsylvania. However, the PUC does not require the carriers to report how many access lines they have in each county, nor does PEMA (Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency) require the counties to report how much they are receiving from each carrier. They could have gotten this information directly from the carriers, but they were told by both PEMA and the counties that the carriers consider specific county-by-county line count and customer count information to be proprietary and will not release it. Plus, there is potentially even a bigger problem in that by law surcharges are based on the number of access lines. There is no agreed upon definition of what constitutes an access line. This wasn’t an issue in 1990 when the original legislation was enacted, but it is an issue now. Particularly with the development of T1 or Trunk Level 1 lines. T1 lines are digital lines that were designed to replace analog lines and each T1 line can carry 24 separate voice capable channels. The unanswered question is should a T1 line be considered one access line or 24 access lines. Obviously that makes a huge difference in what the surcharge revenue should be. There is also the issue that just because an ILEC or a CLEC may have a certain number of assigned numbers, it does not mean that all those numbers are in use. There are other complications having to do with V sellers and services such as inward direct dialing, which allows multiple telephone numbers to use the same access line. Given these and other difficulties, they decided that there was no way they were ever going to be able to determine if the counties are getting the proper amount that they should be from the wire line carriers. They obtained the number of access lines that the county 911 centers reported to PEMA in 2010 multiplied it by the appropriate monthly surcharge and then multiplied that number by 12 to get an annual figure. He will be the first to admit that there are a number of flaws in this approach, not the least of which is what the counties only report to PEMA, the number of access lines the telephone companies report to them. They also assumed that each access line was active for the entire year and they did not provide for any discounts for subscribers with more than 25 lines, which are allowed under the law. While he would hesitate to put too much confidence in estimates they came up with, what was interesting was the amount of variation from county to county. About six counties, including Cumberland and York, had actual wire line surcharge collections that exceeded their estimates. While another six counties, including Philadelphia, Chester and Delaware, collected only about half of their estimate. That is a lot of variation that was hard to account for. Their estimate for Dauphin County indicated about $3.1 million and Dauphin actually collected $1.9 million. Statewide counties collected 71% of their estimate. It is understandable that
the Board may have some concerns about whether the County is receiving all the wire line revenues due to the County.

They asked several counties what they do to ensure that they are receiving all the wire line revenues that they should be, but most indicated that they relied on the providers to submit the correct amount. One county said it monitored receipts to see if providers had missed payments or if there were any unusual drops. Another county said that it compares 911 calls it receives against the numbers contained in its automatic location identification database as a way to see if some lines may not be accounted for, but this technique only provided an indication of possible problems not solid proof. For the most part counties relied on the goodwill of the providers.

They also attempted to estimate the amount of revenue the Commonwealth should be receiving from the wireless surcharges. These funds go directly to the Commonwealth, but the more money PEMA has to distribute the better off the counties are. Their estimates were closer to actual collections for the wireless surcharges than they were for the wire line surcharges. Actual wire line collections were only 71% of their estimate, whereas wireless surcharges were 81% of their estimate. They assumed that all subscribers had their phones active for a full year.

Wireless point-of-sale surcharges – In an effort to capture some revenue from the rapidly increasing market for prepaid phones and minutes, in 2010 the General Assembly enacted a $1.00 surcharge per retail transaction on prepaid phones and the purchase of minutes. The new fee was anticipated to generate between $9 million and $13 million. During the first year only about an additional $4 million was generated or less than half of what was expected. There appears to be several reasons for this and they have not tracked the latest figures, but the point-of-sale surcharge revenues do not appear to be generating any kind of new windfall that will significantly help the revenue picture.

How did Dauphin County compare to the rest of the counties in the state on some of the other key issues. Statewide, they found that the total surcharge revenue, meaning all the surcharges collected at both the State and the County level, covered about 71% of county costs to operate a 911 Center. In comparison, surcharge revenues covered only about 68% of costs for Dauphin County. It is somewhat below the statewide average. In 2010, Dauphin County had the highest cost per staff member of any 911 Center in the State, at $89,055 per staff member compared to the statewide average of $55,359. They also calculated the average cost per 911 call in which Dauphin County faired quite well at $39 per call compared to a statewide average of $62 per call. What they found was a clear relationship between the number of 911 calls received and the cost per call. The busy 911 centers generally had lower costs per call than the 911 centers that only receive minimal calls.

While it is true that the costs of 911 centers has been increasing rapidly in recent years, the centers are also being asked to do much more than simply answering 911 calls, which was what was originally envisioned in the legislation. In addition to the gradual
absorption of the dispatching function, which is obviously a significant additional responsibility, PSAPs are also often involved in a host of other duties, not directly related to answering a 911 call, such as being the point of contact for the CLEAN and JNET computer bases, answering the Crime Stoppers Hotline, assisting first line responders needing GIS assistance and monitoring various alarms and call boxes. Generally the 911 centers have been given these responsibilities with little or no additional funding. Given that the 911 surcharge fees have not been increased since they were first enacted in 1990, it is no wonder that the county 911 budgets are feeling the strain. He asked if the Board has any questions.

Mr. Hartwick stated that one of the most telling parts of this is the ability to collect revenue that by estimates are not being realized; particularly with the total number of phone lines and potentially the reliance on the providers to be able to provide that information. He asked who has the oversight responsibility that would require those telephone companies to actually report those lines and is there a process that the County can take to do its own reconciliation.

Mr. Durgin stated that one of the biggest problems is defining these T1 lines and whether the T1 line is just one access line or is it 24 access lines. These are fundamental questions that the Legislature has not addressed. Even if you had the information it may be difficult to figure out what the proper amount would be. It is his understanding that the PUC does have quite a bit of detailed information on access lines with the phone companies. They do not provide it either. It is confidential data that they have, but it is his understanding that they do have it. At what level, he is not sure. There was an issue about the phone companies providing their information at the County line. They are more by the area code or sub area codes. He didn’t exactly know the answer to Mr. Hartwick’s question, but there are a lot of challenges in trying to find that information. If anyone would have it, it would be the PUC.

Mr. Hartwick stated that he understands there is a discussion related to the legislation of increasing the T1 lines to right now they are able to charge up to 12 lines and to increase that to 23 as a part of the discussion. As a Commissioner, thinking about realizing revenue opportunities, it would be good to have a strategy to do some sort of reconciliation of those actual lines. He asked the County Solicitor to begin the process of notifying or contacting PUC and doing a level of investigation on whether the County wants to go down the road of capturing the revenue that should be earmarked towards 911 rather than using County taxpayer dollars to fund those amounts that were under. He would suggest that the County begin that correspondence and the efforts to track down to the extent that it can.

Mr. Durgin stated that their report does recommend that PUC be involved in that process. Whether they will be willing to or not is a different question.

Mr. Haste stated that if the Legislature does, then they will.
Mr. Hartwick stated that it is a conversation that they can have at CCAP. If there are 67 counties that are beginning to ask the questions and starting to figure out how to do an appropriate reconciliation, he believes that the issue will become...this should be public information.

Mr. Durgin stated that you can’t have a fee based on the provider that is paying the fees information. It has to be verified.

Mr. Hartwick stated that you have to have the ability to reconcile and not just rely on what the provider is providing. It would be great to have some level of reconciliation.

Mr. Durgin stated that he does not disagree.

Mr. Pries thanked Mr. Durgin for appearing before the Board today. The Board appreciates that. He will take some time to review this report after the meeting. He asked what the total salary employee costs were.

Mr. Durgin stated that statewide it was $59,000 and Dauphin County was the highest at $89,000.

Mr. Pries stated that he doesn’t believe the Director makes that much money.

Mr. Durgin stated that it is with benefits.

Mr. Pries stated that the salaries are significantly lower.

Mr. Saylor asked what year was this data collected.

Mr. Durgin stated 2010.

Mr. Pries stated that he looks forward to reading over this. As you are aware this topic is the number one legislative priority of CCAP. The Board does appreciate the Legislative delegation working together on this and making it a top priority as well. Here in Dauphin County it has had a significant impact. Back in 2007, the County put $600 into the fund and now it is over $2.3 million. The staff at EMA does a great job. The County took over Harrisburg in 2011 and the City saved over $700,000 a year. The City had 26 full-time employees and the County is doing it with six. The County later took over Middletown in 2013 and the County is saving Middletown over $300,000 a year. Middletown had six full-time employees and the County took over their work without adding any. He questioned the costs and he will do some research into that.

Mr. Durgin stated that one of the things that their report does talk about is consolidation at the local levels.

Mr. Haste stated that the only thing the report highlighted and again this has been lost in the whole debate about the funding side of it is that legislation has not kept up with
technology and he is not so sure that moving forward the legislation really identifies how to keep up with technology either. That is one of the problems. If a vendor is reporting their number on what they should be taxed on that would be similar to the property tax owners saying here is what I should be assessed on. That part has to be cleaned up as well. If all the property taxpayers got to say what their property was assessed at it would different than what a third party says.

Mr. Durgin stated that there needs to be a way to verify the information. One of the things that they were asked to do and he doesn’t think they did a good job on it was to try to figure out a way of having some of these other technologies contribute, like an IPad.

Mr. Haste stated to have a funding stream rely on technology as this does and then not to be able to keep up with technology is a pretty big flaw in the whole system.

Mr. Durgin stated what about all the text messages, on one accident you could get 500 text messages. They all have to be answered.

Mr. Haste stated that the 911 Center will tell you that the calls per incident have gone up dramatically from what it was 20 years ago. Everybody had to drive somewhere to get to a pay phone or phone. Now, everybody that goes by the accident calls and reports it.

Mr. Hartwick stated that another area that was highlighted in ways to enhance revenue – how can the County put itself in a position to capture all the dollars that should be coming into the system. The idea of selling the phones and not submitting the surcharge, the collection rates there seem to be low. Every one of these little phone shops, he asked if the oversight of that would be the Department of Revenue.

Mr. Durgin stated that it would be the Department of Revenue. Part of the problem was that some of the providers were submitting the $1.00 monthly, but then when they saw the law got changed so it only has to be during a point of sale transaction, they stopped submitting the monthly. They would do it once or twice a year when there was an actual transaction. He doesn’t think anyone anticipated that. It seemed to be one of the reasons why the revenues did not meet the expectations, because they were in a sense overpaying, but once the Retail Transaction law came in they only did it a couple times a year.

Mr. Hartwick stated that the Legislation anticipated between $9 million to $13 million in revenue and it is only at half of those collections. There should be a statewide strategy in order to make sure that counties are realizing what the current legislation provides for. With the enforcement of these rules and the heavy lobbying by the telecom industry, it has always been a challenge, but he thinks from the statewide level if they raise the issues again – it doesn’t appear that they are going to be in a position where they asked for $2. It appears that right now the negotiations are around $1.65. In light of that, there are concerns with revenue. Moving forward, the County should make sure that it is taking a look at all of these areas where they are under collecting and make
sure that there is a strategy to realize the revenue that is currently provided for under the law.

B. Dave Eckhart-Phone Recover Systems and Tim Carson – Dilworth Paxon

1. 911 Revenue Optimization Opportunity

Mr. Eckhart is here representing Phone Recovery Services. With him is Mr. Carson who is with the law firm of Dilworth Paxon. They have been working together to pursue the topic that came up today. They are convinced that the phone companies have not been collecting the proper amounts and remitting proper amounts to the counties. It is not just a Pennsylvania problem. They have found that it is nationwide. They are working with other states and other municipalities in 21 states around the country. They are working with other counties in Pennsylvania. Right now they have agreements and actions moving in Allegheny County and Delaware County. They have been and met with another dozen counties that are interested in pursuing what they are here to talk about today.

He provided a presentation that was used with staff. It has been updated slightly. They are recognizing that in Pennsylvania there are 911 surcharges under the current Act and a new Act that is being worked on that requires the phone companies to bill their customers and remit on a monthly basis to the Commonwealth. These funds are to be used to fund the 911 systems accurately around the Commonwealth. They became aware of a situation that started down in Alabama. One of the experts that they are working with, a gentleman by the name of Roger Snyder, when Alabama was going to raise their fees Alabama has an audit rule that they can go audit the phone companies. Through that audit process, they found out that the phone companies were not properly collecting and remitting. They actually sued a number of those phone companies, including Bell South, which went all the way to the Federal Court. Bell South lost. At that point, Roger and his folks started working with people and created Phone Recovery Services to find out if this problem was in fact nationwide. They did find out that it was. In Dauphin County, their estimate is that the County is receiving $2 million a year less than what it should be from the phone carriers. In Delaware County they thought that they should be receiving $3.2 million, but as they received real data it is more like $6.9 million. What it would be here in Dauphin County, they are not sure until they start working with the County.

Mr. Haste asked if that is an annual amount.

Mr. Eckhart indicated yes. It probably is closer to $3 million for Dauphin County. They won’t know until they start digging.

Mr. Carson stated that Roger Snyder is a computer scientist for 40 years. He has access to a lot of information, which quite honestly Mr. Durgin and the Committee would never have been able to receive. Roger was also aware of a variety of private sources that could be purchased. A lot of it is marketing oriented, but it gets them into how
many lines and things like that. Roger has been able to use a methodology. It is information that is put together to give an accurate portrayal of what the telephone and landscape looks like with respect to how many people have VOIP, PRI, residential wire line into the house, etc. Roger has been able to address the frustration that you heard from Mr. Durgin.

Mr. Eckhart stated that there is no audit provision in the current Act in Pennsylvania. The phone companies will say that this is proprietary information. What they are finding is that you can try to work with the phone companies on what their real count is on their active line count. The only way that you can get that data is to sue them, which does not make everyone comfortable, but it is the way that you are going to get there. The team is prepared to do this work on a fully contingent basis, including the legal work from Dilworth Paxon. The Pennsylvania Legislative Budget & Finance Committee study shows that there is a shortfall. The Committee was frustrated in not being able to get the accurate count on the lines. They have gotten much closer to that. They believe that they can get there with the help of County staff and eventually through the lawsuits. They showed an actual phone bill, which is from Windstream. This is a company down in the Eastern part of the Commonwealth that has a 1,000 phone lines. Of the 1,000 phone lines, they are getting charged for 3 PRI, which they are getting charged $3 a month for 1,000 phone lines. They know this company. It is a VOIP service. Under the Pennsylvania law it is very clear that every ten digit number under VOIP should be getting charged the surcharge. Even with the state discounts this client should be getting charged $289 a month and they are getting charged $3. Where they are finding the shortfall isn’t in the residential lines or the smaller business lines, it is with the bigger companies where they are finding these shortfalls. He also provided a summary of 24 phone bills that they found around the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. One of these is actually in Dauphin County – Comcast Bill for a large accounting firm that has four offices in the State, one in Harrisburg. He is not sure which one of the four is in Dauphin County, but they are only getting charged 11% of what they should be getting charged on a surcharge basis. It is a statewide problem. It is not just in Dauphin County. He is hoping that the County would hire them collectively to go and get the remittances that the phone companies had a fiduciary responsibility to be collecting and remitting and weren’t and aren’t. They found that certain carriers are much worse than others. In Delaware County, the Verizon folks appear to be collecting about 52% of what they should be, whereas XO and Windstream are collecting more like 1% of what they should be collecting and remitting. It varies per carrier. Some of this is almost indefensible. One of the things that the County needs to pay attention to is it looks more likely that a new bill will pass this year. Moving forward hopefully some of the things like the number of bills per PRI and per VOIP services will be addressed in a way that makes sense for the counties. If that bill gets passed, the ability to go back and collect these monies from the phone companies, there will be a line drawn in the sand in terms of statute of limitations. If you haven’t filed or started the process with the phone companies by the time the new bill is enacted, every day that goes by you lose some of what you can recover. It is good that the County is being proactive. They are ready to move forward on the County’s behalf.
Mr. Haste stated that he has seen this before and is in favor of doing it. The Board needs to get a document to the Solicitor’s Office for review so it can move forward. He is aware of the time frame, so he would like to protect the County’s time frame.

Mr. Eckhart indicated that he has given drafts of the contracts to the staff.

Mr. Saylor indicated that he does have draft proposals.

Mr. Eckhart stated that he would be happy to address and work through any comments in terms of those contracts.

Mr. Pries stated that as this is taking place across the United States, he is sure that the phone companies are quite aware of this.

Mr. Eckhart stated that they are starting to wake up. It is starting to make more noise. You will probably start to see a lot of press on this. They are the first people in here that have found this problem and started to approach it. They are in 21 states, different types of litigation. Some of those places are still what is known as “under seal”. The phone companies don’t necessarily even know about it yet.

Mr. Carson stated that they have a number of discussions going on with state attorney generals.

Mr. Haste asked what State charges $5.00 a month.

Mr. Eckhart stated that he can get that information. The $5.00 a month was being charged down in Alabama on the business lines. That was recently changed, but Chicago charges individual phones $3.40 a month. He will provide that information to the Board.

Mr. Haste stated that some of the legislators have a fit over 25 cents.

Mr. Eckhart stated that some places are as low as 30 cents.

Mr. Carson stated that it is important to remember – the debate over the House was largely about whether it should be $1.65 or $2.00. The other thing that the County must keep an eye on is the baseline.

Mr. Haste stated that goes back to my statement before about the property tax owner.

Mr. Carson stated that there are a couple of provisions in the bill that passed the House, which would actually shrink the base – going from 23 down to 12 is one of those and the other one has to deal to VOIP.

Mr. Eckhart stated that one is even more of a concern to him, because the VOIP lines as to what is in the House bill is that the phone companies would only have to bill and
remit on simultaneous calls that they are capable under a VOIP system. For example you may only have 400 phone lines, but only 60 of them can call out at the same time. It is going to lower that count significantly. More problematic to him is it says simultaneous calls as determined by the phone carrier. Try to audit that, because you are not going to know how many simultaneous calls can be made.

Mr. Hartwick stated that it is hypocritical when you say something related to that you never want to enhance any revenue, yet you giving more of a leeway and pass to the telecoms.

Mr. Haste stated that Commissioner Hartwick has mentioned this before that the people who really suffer in this are the seniors. For the most part the seniors still have the landline. The seniors are paying a property tax. As the legislature chooses not to deal with this and make it a user fee, it becomes more of a property tax. Again the seniors lose on both cases.

Mr. Eckhart stated that the residential people are carrying the major cost of the 911 Centers.

Mr. Haste stated and probably using it the least at times.

Mr. Carson stated that residential lines are 29% of the total lines reported and yet residential lines are paying 69% of the fees collected.

Mr. Eckhart stated that it doesn’t even get into the added burden of the fact that because they are not collecting enough through the surcharges that now property taxes have to pick that up.

Mr. Carson stated that he has looked at a lot of different counties in Pennsylvania in terms of what they are budgeting this year as a subsidy for 911. Most of the figures you see are strictly from an operating standpoint. They don’t take into account general obligation bond issues that have been issued to construct systems that will be called upon the future and the debt service on those bonds.

Mr. Eckhart stated that counties are being forced to expand the systems by the FCC to include things like texting and so forth. Those costs are real too.

Mr. Haste stated smart TVs.

Mr. Hartwick stated that there is no ability to keep up with those technological advances with a surcharge on any of those devices.

Mr. Carson gave an example of a situation in North Carolina. If your device can contact 911 you pay a charge. That means that because you broaden the base you can actually reduce the charge.
Mr. Haste stated that is hard for the legislature to put in a 10 second sound bite.

Mr. Hartwick stated and there are also the legal issues about broadband.

Mr. Eckhart stated that they would love to work with the County.

Mr. Pries stated that Mr. Libhart had provided documentation for the calls over the last year – 82% of the calls came in off a device similar to a cell phone. Even though the seniors and others are paying their unfair share of the total cost, they only made 18% of the calls.

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

Ms. Lengle asked if there were any questions on the items in the Salary Board Packet and/or Personnel Packet. (There was none.)

Ms. Lengle indicated that she is requesting a vote on Items #20 and #21. These are security officers.

*It was moved by Mr. Pries and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve Items #20 and #21 of the Personnel Packet.*

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

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

**PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci asked if there were any questions. (There was none.) He indicated that the budget items will be cleaned up and it will be ready for consideration next week. It is large this week. This is the time of the year where the County pays the yearly maintenance on the various copiers.

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

**TRAINING PACKET**

*It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve Item #1 of the Training Packet.*

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

A. Approval of food purchase for Dauphin County Drug & Alcohol Advisory Board Meetings scheduled for May 13, 2015, July 8, 2015, September 9, 2015 and November 11, 2015. *(A Vote is Requested 5/13/15)*

B. Modification to the current PCCD Victims of Crime Act Grant – adds $300,028 to the grant for an additional year ending June 30, 2016 instead of 2015. *(A Vote is Requested 5/13/15)*

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. Pries that the Board approve Items A and B listed above under Items for Discussion.

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

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

Mr. Curcillo reported that a few of the documents listed on the Solicitor’s Report will be put on hold. The rest of the documents will be ready for consideration at next week’s Legislative Meeting.

REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR

Mr. Saylor noted that Congressman Barletta had surgery and is recovering nicely. The Board sends well wishes to him and his family.

That is all he has unless there are questions on him. *(There was none.)*

COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

There was none.

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.